

THE

MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1856.

ART. I.—BOARDMAN ON THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY NOT A PRIESTHOOD: A Sermon preached at the opening of the Sessions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in Nashville, Tenn., on Thursday, May 17, 1855, by the Rev. Henry A. Boardman, D. D., the Moderator of the previous Assembly. Published by order of the Assembly. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board of Education. pp. 84.

THIS sermon, when delivered, carried away with it a venerable assembly of learned men. It also produced a sensation in the community at the time. Dr. Boardman's sermon,—says a correspondent of the Presbyterian Herald—"is spoken of everywhere in terms of high admiration." It was immediately ordered to be published with the Assembly's *Imprimatur*, not only without one voice of dissent, but with much unction of enthusiasm. It was likewise at once issued in a political paper in the city where it was delivered. It appeared also, as soon as possible, in the Presbyterian papers with the highest editorial commendation: "The lovers of sound doctrine, well set forth, will find the opening sermon by Dr. Boardman none too long for their tastes." By the direction of the Assembly it is now published in a neat little book, with large and beautiful type, by the Board of Publication. Thus this sermon—now a little book—comes to us well certified, and fitly clothed to inspire respect.

We are not surprised that this sermon felt its young life so joyously at its birth, and so strongly drew from its surround-

ings the silent smiles of favor, as well as the louder public joy of those that heard it, that published it, and that now read it. It is written in fine English, for which its author is distinguished. Besides, he is accustomed to deliver himself in a very happy manner; which was as much in its favor at the time of its promulgation, as the fine large type and beautiful white paper are in its printed form. Then the theme was in its favor. Such a subject, at such a time, in such an assembly, at once prepared for itself good ground in the minds of the hearers. The ancient enemy is to be slain!—a thousand blessings upon him who lifts his arm for the mighty stroke. Where hearts are gathered there is a feast. Where love travels the way is easy. There are no hard places unto love. It follows bravely on in blissful blindness to the dangers of the way and the blemishes of its hero. Then the whole structure, style, and momentum of the sermon are all adapted to catch and carry away such as are “sick of love” for their own opinions, when one more eloquent than they pronounces them in their midst with due authority and solemnity. The discourse also carries an air of confidence and triumph, which is as a watch-word to wheel the waiting into the ranks. It goes leaping over the mountains of theological difficulty, before which earnest men have stood in deep humility and reverence, and skipping upon the Bether-hills, which have divided the most profound men in the Church of the past, “like a roe or a young hart;” and turns back at the end of every bound, with manifest complacency to greet the smiling multitude that have followed from sympathy in the theme. Many a sentimental dreamer has followed with full and sweet flow of soul the song of Moore,

“Flow on thou shining river,
But ere thou reach the sea,
Seek Ella’s lover, and give her
The wreaths I fling to thee,”

without ever thinking of the absurdity of sending a river on such a mission, to such a place, or imagining for a moment the muss which would be created by a river flowing into Ella’s bower! So we opine many will read this sermon, so pretty in

its style, so smoothly flowing in its stream of eloquence, so plausible in its pleasant theological ease, without ever asking their judgments to detect and adjust its half hidden contradictions, or becoming alarmed at the hideous theological monstrosities which are called into life to serve in the war—which is as often with windmills as with a real enemy.

We were not in the crowd which smiled on this theological disquisition, nor are we any part or parcel of the element in which it floats. The little book came to us quietly, and we have examined it calmly in the midst of the sober atmosphere of our study, in the spirit inspired by "the General Assembly" of the earnest, learned, and pious spirits of the silent dead as they look down upon us from the shelves, and speak to us from out venerable volumes of theological truth. Here the restless and noisy present is shut out; hither those popular prejudices which move the masses do not come except in the faintest echoes; here in the spirit of the commandment that hath promise, we sit humbly and in deep reverence before what is older than we are; and here we propose to make war upon this little book, preferring to the popular voice, an appeal to the strength of this tower of the past, "builded for an armory, whereon there hang a thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men."

We have seldom met such a complete specimen of speaking the truth in unrighteousness as the one afforded us in this little book. It sounds like truth. Here and there is truth forcibly stated; which, however, itself becomes error when held in its connections. An error is boldly stated, and then it is covered by truth handled deceitfully. Again an error is made the occasion for presenting correct inferences. The discussion has no scientific basis; the argument, so far as it deserves the name, is a mere *ad captandum* play upon the surface, the thread of discourse ever accommodating itself to side currents of low prejudices for effect, pleased to touch and tickle the fancy of mere nature. It is strongly sprinkled with subdued sneers and sarcasm at the Episcopal and Roman Catholic communion; and even at what thousands of men, as deeply learned and pious as the preacher, have most devoutly regarded the "awful and tremendous" "powers" and "mysteries"

of the Church or Christianity. The first is highly uncourteous; and the last is inexcusably irreverent, and sinfully profane!

Let not this be regarded as a harsh judgment. We make these declarations as sadly as severely; and we engage to show that they are fully deserved.

Before we proceed to an examination of the doctrine of this discourse, we will just specify a few of the modes of unfair and sophistical dealing which are current in it, and which are adapted, if not designed, to cast dust into the eyes of the unsuspecting and cursory reader.

First: the preacher does not adhere to his own definition of a priesthood; making it less or more as it suits his purpose. Now he elevates it to the very pitch of sacerdotal pomp, to make the contrast great between it and the simplicity of the New Testament sacred office; and now again he sinks it to the most purile level, to hold over and above it the dignity of the New Testament ministry.

Again: he ever confounds the idea of Priest, and High Priest; using these as convertible terms, when it suits him. Sometimes the ministry is contrasted with the high priesthood, to show that to attribute it to a priestly character, would disparage Christ: making the ministry in the New Testament answer to the High-priesthood in the Old Testament, instead of seeing the High-priesthood fulfilled in Christ, and the common priesthood in Christ's own ordained ministry. This he may have learned of Dick,* who imposes upon himself in the same way. A moment's reflection will show any serious truth-seeking mind, that this converting of terms must lead to inexcusable unfairness, and hopeless confusion, of which we have a mournful specimen in this little book.† Is he prepared to speak—does he deserve to be heard, on this solemn subject of the nature of the Christian ministry, who does not see, or cannot feel, the force of the vast difference between Priest and High-priest, both in the nature and functions of these offices, and in their typical significance. Who ever contended that the New Testament ministry was a High-priesthood?

* Dick's Theo. Vol. II, p. 47. † Boardman, p. 5, 21.

Again : He is constantly confounding rites with the functionaries who celebrated them : sacrifices with those who present them : sacraments with those who offer and administer them. He speaks of the men as being *in themselves* media, instead of being such in *their offices* and the *rites* they celebrate and administer.* He that has jugglery enough in this way to turn one thing into another before the eyes of a grave Assembly of Divines, without their seeing the trick, has a basis from which he may rant in the highest style of ridicule and sarcastic eloquence against "heirophants," "bold pretenders," "sacred castes," "arrogant" and "audacious" officials who "interpose *themselves*" between God and man, "arrogating a power which the Apostles themselves would not dared to have assumed."

The preacher, too, has always before his eyes the Levitical and Roman Catholic priesthood, as though these, with their form and contents, were *the only conception* of a priesthood ; attributing, moreover, ever to these, attributes which, every theologian—who has power at all to transfer himself beyond the prejudices and traditions of his own narrow sect, and thus do justice to a system not his own—knows do not legitimately belong to them.

Once more : In this sermon, the ministry, which he owns, is itself made more or less, something or nothing, as it best suits the argument. It rises or sinks, like the "governors" which regulate an engine, according as the steam is up. In showing his hearers that the ministry is "not a priesthood," he shows so many things which *it is not*, that when they are summed together it has been demonstrated that it is *nothing at all*. This we will show at the proper place. The reader will see, during this review, that all these modes of unfair and sophistical dealing run glaringly through the whole treatise.

Is the Christian ministry, in its true sense and substance, a priesthood, in the true sense and substance of a priesthood ?

The question is not as to the outward form, but as to the inward power—not of the objective contents, but of its true

* Page 32.

and essential essence. The question is not, as to a mediation of either Levitical or Roman priest, by a lamb, by blood, or by transubstantiated bread and wine ; but it is, whether there is, in the Christian dispensation, *any* mediation, by means of *any* rites, performed by *any* class of men—these rites, and the men who officiate in them, *divinely constituted*, and *alone* entrusted with their administration. The question is not whether there is a mediation in this or that form ; but whether there is any mediation at all. The question is not, whether there is in Christianity a Levitical or Roman priesthood ; but whether there is in it the **SUBSTANCE** of which Judaism had the shadow ; and the **TRUE**, of which we Protestants believe the Roman priesthood, in the contents which it claims in transubstantiation, is a corruption.

What is a priest ? “One who performs the sacred rites.” It is not necessary to a priesthood that it present offerings that in themselves take away sin, or make an atonement. This even the Levitical priesthood could not : “For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins.” Heb. 10 : 4. These offerings, even those of the High-priest himself, were not *in themselves* mediators, nor were the priests or High-priests in themselves such. They only shadowed the true substance, were only to sinners a test and testimony, pointing them to the true High-priest and the true atonement. Yet they were priests, offered sacrifices, and their functions were those of a priesthood. So far from offering sacrifices, whether bloody or not, constituting essentials of a priesthood, these offerings could be made, in the Old Testament, by persons who were not Levitical priests—it was done by Abel, Noah, Abraham, and Job ; yet they were not priests.

A priest under any religion, is one who by authority not given to others, performs the sacred rites, which are appointed and proper under that system of religion : one, therefore, who, in his office stands between God and man, doing that by God’s authority, which God has appointed to be done by him for the reconciliation of God and man.

We accept fully the definition of a priesthood given by Dr. Boardman ; or rather, which is in part at least, quoted by him

from some one whose name he has not given. "The radical idea of Priesthood, is that of mediation between God and man." A priest is "one who stands as a mediator between God and the people, and brings them to God by virtue of certain ceremonial acts which he performs for them, and which they could not perform for themselves without profanation, because they are at a distance from God, and cannot, in their own persons, venture to approach towards him."

We accept this also as a correct definition of the Christian ministry. It is this fully, in form and in substance ; and in going on to prove that the ministry is not what this definition calls for, Dr. Boardman would prove, were his arguments sound, that there is no ministry. If ministers do not mediate between God and the people—if it is not their office to bring the people to God—if they do not bring the people to God by virtue of certain ceremonial, or sacramental acts, which they perform for them—if the people can empower or authorize any one to perform these ministerial acts, or *can* perform these ministerial acts themselves, or can authorize and empower any one to do it, because they stand in the same official nearness to Him—and if the people can approach God in their own persons without these intervening ministrations of the word and sacraments—if all this is so, pray what is the ministry ? It is nothing but what the people have themselves; and all that God does by ministers is not necessary to salvation. How truly has Dr. Boardman said, in the second sentence of this sermon: "The controversy respecting it involves the very nature, as well as the constitution of the Christian ministry." Yes, truly ; and it involves its very existence. In this view we most devoutly thank God in the name of all Christians, that this sermon, endorsed by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, is the boldest and most sweeping heresy promulgated in any age of the Church. The very Anti-Christ that sweeps away every vestige of our Saviour's institutions, denying thus that He has come in the flesh, and that He is carrying on any mediation in His Church on earth by stewards of his mysteries. "Let it be anathema ;—and let all the people say, Amen !"

Is it too strong to say that Dr. Boardman entirely demolishes the ministry? Let the following extract be considered, in which he professes to exhibit the "monstrous assumptions," the "grossness" not only of "Rome," but also as "elaborately vindicated by a large number of so-called Protestant prelates and clergymen, on both sides of the Atlantic."

"They constitute, with the priesthood of the other hierarchies, the only legitimate channel of spiritual communion between this world and heaven. If men would worship God, they must wait upon their ministrations; for they alone, have free access to the mercy-seat. If they would be pardoned, forgiveness comes only through their intervention. If they would obtain renewing and sanctifying grace, they must receive the sacraments at their hands. For, they only, have "the gift of the Holy Ghost;" they are the stewards of the Church—the depository of Divine grace; and this grace, it is their prerogative to dispense in baptism and the Lord's Supper."

The powers and functions here mentioned, Dr. Boardman teaches do *not* belong to the ministry. Now let the reflecting reader just *reverse* the language quoted, and apply it to the Christian ministry, and he will at once see that there is not a vestige of a ministry left. Thus: If men would worship God, they must *not* wait upon their ministrations! If they would be pardoned, forgiveness comes *not* through their intervention—no sacraments needed. If they would obtain renewing and sanctifying grace, they must *not* receive the sacraments at their hands—they can come to God and be saved without baptism and the Lord's Supper, even while they wilfully reject them! They have not alone the gift of the Holy Ghost officially, though this is the very power which was breathed upon the disciples at first, in the way of earnest, (John 20: 22;) for which they were to wait at Jerusalem, (Luke 24: 49;) which actually came upon them on Pentecost, (Acts 2,) and which is communicated, as the unction and soul of their official functions, by the laying on of hands. (2 Cor. 3: 8.) They are *not* the stewards of the Church! giving the direct lie to the Apostle, who says, they are "stewards of the mysteries of God." They are not the depositaries of divine grace: though they

have the ministry of the word, (Acts 6: 4,) of the Spirit, (2 Cor. 3: 8,) of righteousness, (2 Cor. 3: 9,) of reconciliation, (2 Cor. 5: 18,) and of the administration of the sacraments. It is not their prerogative to dispense this grace in baptism and the Lord's Supper ! Thus there are no means of grace—not one of the ministrations of the ministry is a means of grace ; and a sinner can find his way back to God without any mediation of *actus ministerii*, which the ordained ministry alone have power and authority to perform ! Thus, in demolishing the priesthood of Rome and of "so-called Protestants," he demolishes every conception of a ministry, leaving not one stone upon another. No wonder if, after this strong wind, earthquake and fire, tearing down mountains of long-established faith, and breaking rocks of ancient orthodoxy, there would have been heard, in that grave Assembly on this Presbyterian Horeb, a "still small voice," coming forth from their own venerable symbols, crying against such zeal for the Lord, in mild, but keen reproof : "What dost thou here Elijah ?"

The following extract is in the same spirit as the one already quoted. Putting the words, Lord's Supper, for "mass," and ministry for "priest," and avoiding the false issue slyly raised, which implies that the mediation claimed in the case, is through the *men*, instead of being through their *office* and *acts*, you will see that the extract strikes at the very root of all conception of a ministry. It is the very language which infidelity would adopt as its own, against the entire idea of the Christian system, as represented in the Church, or kingdom of God on earth. Here is the extract :

"They stand where the Aaronic priests stood, between God and man. There can be no acceptable approach to God except through them ; no pardon, except through their intercession and the sacrifice of the mass. Whoever would be reconciled to God, whoever would be cleansed from sin, whoever would receive an answer to his prayers, whoever would triumph over death, must invoke the mediation of the priest. The sacrifice he presents and the sacraments he administers, are clothed with an efficacy which meets every want and provides for every exigency of our moral nature. And no one need

fear for the result, who is willing to confide the whole business of his salvation to his priest."

Mark the sneer in the last sentence! Yet is it not virtually a sneer at the truth? Will not he be saved who submits in obedience to the direction of one of Christ's ministers? Will not he who repents as directed, believes the truth as proclaimed, trusts in Christ as held up, is baptised by one authorized, and receives the holy Supper in the true spirit of it, and leads an obedient life in faith—will not he be saved? Can he be saved without this? Would Dr. Boardman so tell a sinner coming to him, asking the question, "What must I do to be saved?" Would he tell him you can get to heaven without anything that I can do for you, by virtue of my ministry? No. He would say to him repent, believe, be baptised, receive the holy Supper, and be devoted in your life. If the man would answer him: I wish to be saved without the Church, without baptism, without the holy Supper, without Church authority over me, without any ministerial help or direction you can perform. Boardman would answer him, *not in the Presbyterian Church can you do this!* Behold a priest!—a mediator between God and a sinner!—ministerial intervention—and this in the person of Dr. Boardman himself.

In being "very jealous for the Lord" against the Roman Church and priesthood, he strikes away the foundations beneath himself, and the whole Assembly before him, as well as the very substance of the ministry, and "the entire structure of the New Testament." Hear him again:

"Rome has transferred this element, (the priestly) the very heart and core of the Mosaic dispensation, into the new economy. *The priesthood is perpetuated in the Christian Church.*"

Did not the *heart* and *core* of the Old Testament economy pass into the New? Did Christ come to destroy? No. He came not to destroy, but to fulfill. The High-priesthood passed into Himself, and was fulfilled, and continued, in Himself. The sacrifices ended in Him, because they were fulfilled in Him. The common priesthood, passed away in the ministry because it was fulfilled in it. The shadow disappeared in the substance. Was then the shadow something, and the sub-

stance nothing? The office of High-priest, which belonged to the Holy of Holies, "behind the veil," is now continued in heaven itself: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." The priesthood, however, the offices of which were confined to the holy place, (Heb. 11: 6, 7,) is continued in its substance, in the Church on earth, in the ministry. When Jesus our High-priest, had offered himself a sacrifice "without the gate," he ascended to the Holiest in heaven; "far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." But did he leave no order of men behind him to carry on the stewardship of the mysteries of his grace in the Church? Yes: "He gave some, apostles: and some, prophets: and some, evangelists: and some, pastors and teachers." For what purpose? "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." How long: "Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Eph. 4: 10-14.

No fault, then, is to be found with the Roman Church for transferring "the heart and core of the Mosaic dispensation into the New Economy." Would that they had transferred *no more* than this. Their error pertains not to the priest, but to the offering: making that the Lord, which is only the Lord's body and blood: making that the Saviour, which is only his saving sacrament: offering him still "without the gate" who has already been offered, and has passed behind the veil "into heaven itself:" offering Him often, as the High-priest did the typical sacrifices which cannot be done: "For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now ONCE in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. 9: 26. Here is the mistake of the Roman Church; not in transferring the heart and core of the priesthood; but in making the offering a Saviour instead of a saving medium.

Our Saviour did not only take up in himself, fulfill, and continue the High-priesthood, but also the Prophetic and Kingly

elements of the Old dispensation. These also have been transferred to, and are continued in, the Christian dispensation. In the Church on earth He has left the Prophetic, Priestly, and Kingly elements, and powers: and of these, his ministers are the embodiments in the Church, holding these, opening them, and administering them to the people. This is the "structure of the New Testament."

Does our Saviour make any exception in regard to any one of these offices and elements when he constitutes his ministers his vicars? Does he say that he communicates to them, and reposes in them, the Prophetic, to teach: the Kingly, to rule: and not the Priestly to celebrate the sacred rites, and administer as stewards the "mysteries of God?" There is no such limitation or exception. Let Dr. Boardman, and the General Assembly, look at the papers of commission, and then say what right they have to say that Christ's ministry has received the Phrophetic and Kingly, but not the Priestly. "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." John 20: 21-23. To this passage Dr. Boardman replies thus:

"To this it is a sufficient reply, that whatever the power of binding and loosing may denote, the efficacious remission of sin is not a sacerdotal, but a judicial, function. We need not, therefore, stop to inquire whether the right of absolution appertains to the Christian ministry; for even if they had that right, (which they certainly have not, in the Romish sense of the term,) it would not prove them to be priests."

The "remission of sin is a judicial function!" This is the first time we have heard of a Judge holding the power to pardon! We thought the power of a judge, like that of the law which he administers, did not go beyond deciding, or judging and sentencing. We thought remission was by blood, by atonement, over which the priest presides. The preacher "needs, therefore, stop to inquire whether the right of absolution appertains to the Christian ministry." Suppose even that it did belong to the judicial or kingly function, it still lodges

somewhere in the ministry, for Christ solemnly placed it there; and thus against Dr. Boardman and the General Assembly, places the ministry between God and the people.

The same three offices, with those corresponding powers were entrusted to the ministry in the last formal and solemn commission, just before he "ascended," (Eph. 4 : 11,) and gave the ministry to the world as his ascension gift, to be his presence unto men. (Math. 28 : 18-20.) The reader will observe in this commission these three elements: power to *rule*, which is the kingly; authority to *baptise*, the priestly; and command to *teach*, the prophetic. "And Jesus came, and spake unto them, (the eleven) saying, All *power* is given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye *therefore* and teach all nations, *baptising* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching* them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am *with you* always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

This position of office between God and the people, with the true functions, are awarded them in the very names by which they are called.

1. The Prophetic office is indicated by the name, Evangelist, Pastor, and Teacher, Eph. 4 : 11. Comp. Jer. 3 : 15. 1 Peter 5 : 2, 3, 4.

2. The Priestly office is indicated by the names, Ministers, Stewards of the mysteries of God. 1 Cor. 4 : 1. The word "mysteries" evidently refers to the Sacraments, which he alone can celebrate, and by them open to the people access to grace, and God through them—the highest idea of priesthood. Dr. Boardman's and the General Assembly's own highest authority speaks in relation to the ministry and this passage, thus: "As he *dispenses* the manifold *grace* of God, and the ordinances instituted by Christ, he is termed steward of the mysteries of God."*

3. The Kingly office is set forth by the names, Bishop, Presbyter, or Elder. Acts 20 : 28. 1 Peter 5 : 1. 1 Tim. 5 : 1. 17 : 19.

* Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, Chap. 4, page 349.

The Christian minister is also called "ambassador," in which is included his whole power, in all these offices, by which he goes forth with plenary authority to treat with men. 2 Cor. 5: 20. Eph. 6: 20.

Each of these offices, as set forth under these names, make the Christian minister mediator between God and the people. As bishops, presbyters, rulers, they must be *over* the people. As ministers, they *must have that in charge* which is to be administered; and as stewards, they must be "rulers over his household, *to give them their portion of meat* in due season." Luke 12: 42; or, according to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, they must hold in their official hands, the "manifold grace of God, and the ordinances instituted by Christ," to "*dispense*." That there is, in "*the right use*" of the sacraments, "*grace not only promised and offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such as that grace belongeth unto,*" even the Presbyterian Church *used to believe!* The same ancient work just quoted, also teacheth that baptism is properly administered "by a minister of the Gospel, lawfully called thereunto."* The names, evangelist, pastor, and teacher, also indicate that those visited, led, and taught, shall receive the Evangelist with reverence, follow the leadings of the Pastor submissively, and hear the teacher in that which he does teach. To say that any of these names indicate anything less than an official mediation and intervention between God and the people, is to turn the whole solemnity in which these offices are referred to, as well as the very idea of an office, into absurdity. It is the silliest exhibition of theological childishness, when men suffer themselves, like children, to be frightened out of all their wits, by what their alarmed fancy supposes to be grim and dangerous monsters frowning out of the dreadful shades of Romanism. If Romanism has become superstitious, that is certainly no reason why we should ignore our Protestant foundations in "*General Assembly.*"

Once more, we find that the Apostles always claimed this position between God and the people. Paul speaks of him-

* See Westminster Confession of Faith, Chap. 28, vi. Also Chap. 29, 7.
Ibid. Chap. 28, 2.

self as "separated unto the gospel of God." Rom. 1: 1. Again: "Paul an apostle, not of men, neither by men." Gal. 1: 1. Again he declares his irresponsibility to the people: "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment." 1 Cor. 4: 3. He suffers no contradiction in that which he teaches, no, not from an angel. Gal. 1: 8-10. He is teacher from God—not they, not man, nor angels. They *must* hear him. In reference to the priestly dispensation of the Lord's Supper, he holds the same position. 1 Cor. 11: 28. In regard to the transmission of the office to others the same position of the ministry is recognized. Paul reminds Timothy that he had received a gift—the gift of ministerial authority—from the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. 1 Tim. 4: 14; 2: 2. Also Titus 1: 5.

Thus we see in the Christian ministry every element of a true priesthood. There is mediation between God and the people—he brings them to God by virtue of certain ceremonial, sacramental, or rather prophetic, priestly, and kingly acts, which the people cannot perform for themselves, because they are not in the same official nearness to Him, and cannot, in their own persons, without these services—teaching, baptism, the holy supper, pastoral care and rule—approach Him unto salvation. We ask not that the word be retained. With the "judicious Hooker," we are willing rather that it shall pass away, as being somewhat easy of abuse. Let the New Testament terminology be used, which, as we have seen, embodies the heart and core, the sum and substance, designating a truly divine order of officers, with truly divine and supernatural functions, having in charge the administration of saving rites, graciously and livingly from and in Christ, which are the only means and way by which sinners are reconciled to God.

In regard to the nature of the ministry, Dr. Boardman says:

"The doctrine held by our own Church, and by most of the Protestant Churches, is, that the Ministry has been constituted to feed, and, in conjunction with the representatives of the people, to govern the Church; that their chief functions are, to preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments of Bap-

tism and the Lord's Supper, together with the exercise of discipline; and that "their power is wholly moral, or spiritual, and *that* only ministerial or declarative."*

By this quotation Dr. Boardman would make the impression, that it is the teaching of the Presbyterian Church that the ministerial official power is, *in all its functions*, "only ministerial and declarative." It does not so teach, as any one can see, by reference to that document. The language quoted has reference only to the *judicial* function in the exercise of discipline. It refers to the exercise of the kingly function, and not to the prophetic and priestly. It is a deceitful handling of that document when it is thus brought in to fatten the sentiment of the quotation which evidently is, that the ministry is a mere representative embassage from God to man, having no reflex function from man to God. If even this were the only conception and force of the ministry, it would not help the argument against which we are contending. For in that case the ministry would still be between God and the people—the one sent would intervene between the sender and those to whom he is sent. Whether he comes from God to teach or to rule, as prophet or king, he is still a mediator. Thus can the prophetic and priestly offices both rest at last in the priestly. It is the *middle*, the *central* function. It is between the two, a daysman, laying its hands upon both. The altar, sacrifice, mediation is the central idea in all religion. Aaron is in the mount when the law is proclaimed, and in the council where transgressors are judged. The prophets and the kings must alike bow at his altar and bring offerings to him. When the people recognized in Christ only the Prophet and the King, crying "This is that prophet," and "Let us make him a King," he withdrew, "and departed again into a mountain himself alone." John 6: 14, 15. He was both these, a prophet and a king, but he could be neither of these to those who had not seen in him the priest. The central, ruling function was pointed out by John the Baptist: "BEHOLD THE LAMB OF GOD, which taketh away the sin of the world."

* Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church, Chap. 8.

The earnest question, however, still comes up, Does the nature of the Christian ministry involve nothing more than that hinted in the extract just quoted? Is the New Testament minister one whose official activities only turn from God to, and terminate on, the people? Is the office only to bring God to the people, or is it also to bring the people to God? Does God only approach the people by and through his official acts, or do the people also come to God by these acts? Are its functions only declarative from God to man, or also restorative and remedial of man to God? Does God only seek the people through their ministerial acts, or are the people also to seek God through these media?—by their aid, intervention, and the acts which they are alone appointed and authorized to perform for them, and with them? These questions need only be asked to elicit the true answer from every thinking mind. To say that the office turns one way and not the other, is to impose upon ourselves an absurdity. Any one who reflects for one moment, will grant, that, in the New Testament, there are rites, as baptism and the Lord's Supper, which the minister, appointed of God, authorized by Him, and separated from the people for that purpose, alone dare perform, and these are performed *for* the people, by way of opening to them, as in baptism, the way into the covenant and grace of God, and carrying forward or nourishing the life of grace in them to fitness for heaven, as in the Holy Supper. The idea involved in the keys—make of them anything we may, short of nothing at all*—only not forgetting that they were given by God to His ministers to be used by them in reference to the people—at once shows that their power is to open *back* towards God as well as forward toward the people; for they are not the keys to hu-

* "The most remarkable power which these ministers have claimed, and that on account of which the greatest homage has been paid to them, is the power of *absolving* or *setting free*. This claim has in a manner been universal. Luther believed that he was to absolve as well as Tetzeli. Every person who says that the sole office of a minister is to preach the Gospel, says so because he believes *this is the way to absolve*. There are most serious differences about the nature of the power and mode in which it is to be exercised, none at all about the existence of it, and about its connection in some way or other with the Christian ministry."

Maurice's Kingdom of Christ, p. 344.

man hearts, but they are "the keys of the kingdom of heaven."† Math. 16: 19. Paul is not afraid of "monstrous assumption," when he says that he labors "to *present* every man perfect in Christ Jesus." Col. 1: 25. See also 2 Cor. 11: 2. He also fears not to say, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel." 1 Cor. 4: 15; 9: 2. The same Apostle calls the ministry which Christ had given them "the ministry of *reconciliation*." 2 Cor. 5: 18. But why do we speak on this subject further, when the very idea of an office implies the double relation of its functions to him from whom it is held, and to those for whom it is held.

After what has now been said in regard to the nature of the Christian ministry, as involved in "the entire structure of the New Testament," it is hardly necessary to make answer to an argument built upon "the most remarkable and significant circumstance, that in passing from the Old Testament to the New, we should leave behind the whole vocabulary of terms proper to a sacerdotal system." We need only ask, is this all that we leave behind when we pass from the Old Testament to the New? The whole chrysalis of outward Judaism is left behind. See the fossil remains of a former stadium in the new creation half hidden in every chapter and verse! The eternal life that lived in the way of hope and promise under these

† It was to dispense this blessing (the remission of sins) to us, that the keys were given to the Church, (Math. 17: 19; 18: 18.) For, when Christ gave commandment to his apostles, and conferred on them the power of remitting sins, (John 20: 23) it was not with an intention that they should merely absolve from their sins those who were converted from impiety to the Christian faith, but rather that they should continually exercise this office among the faithful. In the communion of saints, therefore, sins are continually remitted to us by the ministry of the Church, when the presbyters or bishops, to whom this office is committed, confirm pious consciences, by the promises of the Gospel, in the hope of pardon and remission; and that as well publicly as privately, according as necessity requires."

Calvin's Institutes, Vol. II, p. 242.

"To these officers (church officers) the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the Gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require."

Westminster Confession of Faith, Chap. xxx. II.

What will Dr. Boardman say to this? This once belonged to Presbyterianism. It furnishes some ground for Milton's line:

"New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large."

ceremonial coverings, slumbering as under dark shadows of night, toward the dawn of the coming morning, has awakened to a glorious birth. The dispensation of life is ushered in. The ritual that now remains is not to show life coming, but to bring us into communion with life that has come. Now answer, —Because so much is left behind, beside sacerdotal terms, is therefore the New Testament not an unbroken continuation of the same gracious dispensation from God to man? If some things are left behind, should we, therefore, leave *all* behind? Is the substance changed, except in the way of evolution and development? Is it now another thing? Not a whit more than an infant passing on from an embryo state into the external world by birth, is another being—no more than a child loses its identity, or any elements of its being, when it grows up to manhood, because it then leaves behind those things proper to childhood, now proper no more. As the same life which lived in the larva, at a later period, drops its heavy covering and soars with wings, so the new eternal life, flowing freely in the Christian ritual, and by God's direction, dispensed by the Christian ministry, may well lose its onward appendages while the substance is the same.

The same argument by which the priestly is here denied to the Christian ministry, would also deny the High-priestly to Christ. For other terms and titles are also applied to Him; the term High-priest being applied to Him, only when it is required in showing that he is his true anti-type;—the common names applied to him being altogether different. Nor did he offer the same sacrifices, nor in any way do we find carried over into the New Testament, the sacerdotal appendages characteristic of the High-priesthood.

The second argument upon which Dr. Boardman relies, to establish his view of the Christian ministry, and on the ground of which he denies all priestly elements to it, is this:

“The doctrine of an official human priesthood in the Church, *is in a high degree derogatory to the Lord Jesus Christ as the only priest of the new Dispensation.*”

His whole argument under this head is entirely neutralized by the confounding which we specified in the beginning of this

article, as running through the whole treatise: namely, presenting the Christian ministry in contrast with the *form* of the Levitical priesthood, and not recognizing in it its inward substance and outward completion—and in using the words Priest, and High-priest, as *convertible* terms, using one and the other, as it suits him. The intelligent reader need not be informed what the difference is between these two offices—they differ as the holy place differed from the Holy of Holies, and as the Church on earth from the Church in heaven. They differ so much, that the Priest was not permitted to go into the High-priest's places of offering on pain of instant death! Is it answered that Christ is also called a Priest? We answer, Yes: the higher includes the lower, but the lower does not include the higher—the High-priest was priest, but not *visa versa*. Keeping his eyes clear from the dust cast up by this confounding, the reader will feel that the whole pretended argument under this head, rising at times into the heights of sarcastic eloquence, is merely disgusting *ad captandum*, entirely unworthy of Dr. Boardman.

The priesthood was the medium by which the people came to the High-priest; the High-priesthood was fulfilled, and is continued in Christ, the priesthood, in its substance, in the Christian ministry—through word, sacraments, and ruling power the ministry mediates between Christ and the people, brings Christ to them, and them to Christ. The Christian ministry can, therefore, no more be derogatory to Christ, than the Priesthood was to the High-priesthood. Christ, the High-priest, is within the veil, in heaven itself: his ministry is on earth; and by them, and through them officially, he carries on his own mediation in the Church on earth—in all his offices: as prophets, he teaches by them, as priests: in the sacraments which they alone can dispense, he offers his body and blood, “not corporally, or carnally in; with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are, to their outward senses;”* and by them, “the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred, by the

* Westminster Confession. Chap. xxix. vii.

Holy Ghost to such as this grace belongeth unto :** as kings, he rules by them and divinely ordained elders, the Church, having given them power "to govern well in the house and kingdom of Christ,"† admitting and excluding, opening and closing the door of the church.

Instead of a derogation to Him, they are the proper representatives of His honor—as the priests were to the High-priest—as under officers are to a king—as smaller planets, that move brightly around, are to their glorious central sun.

This answers abundantly Dr. Boardman's questions : "What place is there for an earthly priesthood *now*?" since "the antitype has appeared?" "What remains for a priest to do? What powers can he exercise, what offices can he perform, without invading CHRIST's prerogative and impugning the perfection of his Priesthood?" (HIGH-priesthood, the old sophistry !)

To avoid the conclusion that the true fulfillment—not the destruction, except by fulfillment—of the Old Testament Priesthood is to be sought in the New Testament, Dr. Boardman finds the completion of the Old Testament Priesthood in itself!—makes it a *real* instead of typical priesthood!

"Its priesthood was a real priesthood, and, within the prescribed sphere, their rites had a genuine efficacy—*because* they pointed to the Great High Priest and the true sacrifice."

"Its priesthood was a *real* priesthood!" What a direct flying in the face of every profession of the Old Testament, and of every declaration of the New. "Their rites had a *genuine efficacy*!" Hear Paul: "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins." Heb. 10. He adds, that they had a genuine efficacy, "*because* they pointed to the great High-Priest and the true

* Westminster Confession, Chap. xxviii, vi. † Form of Gov. of Pres. Ch. Chap. iv.

sacrifice." Hence they were shadowy or typical and not real : the genuine efficacy was in that to which they pointed, not in those rites. The very fact that all the Old Testament shadows have become substance in the New,—that the High-priesthood was taken up and made real in Him who was at once Priest and Sacrifice!—this very fact gives true dignity, power, and reality to the Christian ministry as a real (and not a shadowy, or merely representative) mediation. It is this that the great Apostle feels to be the true power of his ministry, when he stands between Christ and the people, exclaiming, as His official organ, with an unction that moves heaven and earth, God in Christ, and man, toward each other : " Seeing then that we have a great High-priest, *that is passed into the heavens*, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities : but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us *therefore* come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Heb. 4 : 14–16. Here is reality. Here is a mediation that has genuine efficacy. Here is Jesus Christ come in the flesh ; a mediation that touches our nature. Here is a ministry, mediating between man and true powers. Here we are come to a real, saving constitution, to the Church of the first born, the body of Christ, and to a ministry which rests in this body, and is a living organ from Christ. Here is a mediation from Him who though passed into the heavens, reaches the people through his human nature, and in human nature, in the persons and official power of a human ministry. Here is a Christ, the hem of whose garments a poor sinner can touch in the Church. Here, in the Church, are God's transactions with men in sacraments which do not only represent grace (this is Judaism,) but confer it. Here is a ministry that does not only "serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things," like their prototypes, but which stands before "an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle," and opens the true substance of grace to the people—administers the true washing in baptism, and gives the "communion" of the true life in the Lord's Supper, so that in the

excellent language of the Assembly's Larger Catechism, "they that worthily communicate in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, do therein feed upon the body and blood of Christ, not after a corporal or carnal, but in a spiritual manner ; yet truly and really."* The rites of the New Testament are thus true means of grace ; they are not the Lord, but the Lord's body—they are not saviours, but saving : those who alone by God's appointment preside over them, stand in real official mediation between God and man, and in their office and acts, and rites, we have the true fulfillment, substance, essence and continuation of the priestly function.

Dr. Boardman states his third argument thus: "In the third place, the scriptures exclude this theory, by teaching that men may come to Christ and be accepted by him, without the intervention of any human mediator."

On this point, the preacher continues his discourse farther, thus: "In the mouths of professsd Protestants, who hold the sacerdotal theory of the ministry in its mildest form, it means, 'ministerial intervention that sins may be forgiven.'† This, it is alleged, is 'the essence of priesthood,' and this is declared to be indispensable under the present economy. If it were simply designed to teach, by this language, that in the ordinary administration of his government over the Church, God is pleased to employ the agency of the ministry in bringing men into a state of salvation, there would be no room for controversy. But this is not the idea. It is intended that the Christian ministry occupies a position analogous to that of the Aaronic priests : that like the latter, God has constituted them a sacred *caste* to stand between himself and our race ; that he has made it obligatory upon all men to approach him *through them* ; that he will accept the worship of a sinner only as *they* present it, and that however humble, penitent and devout may be his spirit, he has no more ground to expect forgiveness and renewal, so long as he refuses to avail himself of their mediation, than a Jew would have had to expect his sin-offering to

* Page 291.

† See Bishop Whittingham's two discourses on "the Priesthood in the Church."

be accepted, who, instead of bringing his victim to the priest, sacrificed it with his own hand upon his own altar. *This* is the doctrine. And if it be not clearly "another gospel," it will at least be difficult to show how the fundamental truths of the Gospel can coalesce with it."

Does Dr. Boardman mean that God has established any other than an "ordinary administration" in his Church by which to bring man into a state of salvation? If so, what is that other way? We know of none. The ordinary, and the *only* way, is by preaching,† the sacraments, and government: which powers he has *only*, and *absolutely* deposited with the ministry; and those who would come into a state of salvation must come *through these rites*, and submit to these functions—functions, in spite of Dr. Boardman, placed by divine appointment nowhere but with "a sacerdotal *caste* to stand between himself and our race"—as the preacher sneeringly alludes to this "awful and tremendous" truth!

It is farther said in this extract, that it is held by the theory against which he contends, that God "has made it obligatory upon all men to approach Him through *them*," that is, through these priests. This he knows to be a false issue. He knows that even the Old Testament saints did not come to God through the *priests*, but through the *rites* and *offerings* of the priests. How unfair! Who pretends that men are to come to Christ through the ministers? No one—not even a Roman Catholic. But who denies that men *must* come, and *can* come to Christ, alone through the rites of Christ's institution in His Church? Who denies it, but fanatics, Quakers and rationalists.

† "The power to save resides in God, but, as the same Apostle (Paul) testifies in another place, he displays it in the preaching of the Gospel. That we may know, therefore, that we have an inestimable treasure communicated to us from *earthen vessels*, (2 Cor. 4: 7) God himself came forward, and as he is the Author of this arrangement, *so he will be acknowledged as present in this institution*. As formerly he was not content with the written law, but appointed the priests as interpreters, at whose lips the people might inquire its true meaning, so in the present day, he not only requires us to be attentive to reading, but has appointed teachers for our assistance. Though the power of God is not confined to external means, yet he has confined us to the ordinary manner of teaching, the *fanatical rejecters* of which necessarily involve themselves in many fatal errors."

The preacher, in this extract, teaches correctly that a Jew could not expect to have his sin-offering accepted, if he, "instead of bringing his victim to the priest, sacrificed it with his own hand upon his own altar." No—God would not suffer his order, and his rites to be thus set aside. But he teaches, in the same extract, that a sinner "humble, penitent, and devout," may "expect forgiveness and renewal," though "he refuses to avail himself of the mediation" of the Christian ministry in the rites which they celebrate and dispense by the appointment and authority of Christ. That is, a sinner, "humble, penitent, and devout," may go slyly to some stream and baptize himself with his own hand, and go into some closet and devoutly celebrate the Lord's Supper by himself on his own table, and thus be his own bishop, presbyter, and pastor!—and all this he would do by Dr. Boardman's direction, lest by any means he might seek Christ through a mediator! Suppose now that Dr. Boardman should undertake to correct this man in this fanatical and foolish conduct, telling him that he must receive baptism and the Lord's Supper, teaching and discipline, at the hands of an ordained minister, the man would reply to him sharply in the Doctor's own strong language: "We brand this dogma as contravening the express teachings of the New Testament, which invites and requires men to look *directly* to Christ for the pardon of sin and other blessings. It claims that we can approach the Mediator himself, only through *another* mediator. The bare statement of this flagrant heresy must revolt any intelligent man not already steeped in Romish errors. One is at a loss how to stigmatize it; whether as more derogatory to the Saviour, or more discouraging and tyrannical towards man!" In the language of this sermon we say with all our heart: "If this be not clearly 'another Gospel,' it will at least be difficult to show how the fundamental truths of the Gospel can coalesce with it." Another Gospel?—no, it is no Gopel at all!

Hear farther: "When we examine the four Evangelists, we constantly find the Saviour inviting sinners to come directly to Him. When we turn to the book of Acts and the Epistles, we hear the Apostles, in one voice, and in addressing people

of all tongues and nations, repeating the same lesson: ‘Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.’ Never do they say, ‘come to us and we will obtain forgiveness for you.’”

They invite sinners to come directly to Christ. Where? How? Come to him how? Without ordinances? Believe on Him without submitting to ordinances? No. The Apostles never invited any sinner to come to Christ, except through sacraments—sacraments, too, which none but they themselves were authorized to administer. Invited them to come and “believe on the Lord Jesus Christ;” and is that all? No. Here is the grand sophistry, which we have over and over exposed in this review. Besides inviting them to repent and believe, they also invited them to be baptized and receive the other sacrament, on pain of reprobation! The gift of the Holy Ghost unto sanctification is ever and only promised on submission to baptism. This is the order in which our Saviour himself taught Nicodemus, placing baptism first: “Water and the Spirit.” John 3:5. This is the order in which Peter replied to the direct question of penitent sinners, “What shall we do?” “Repent and be baptized—and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Acts 2:37, 38. Paul was astonished when he heard that the converts who had been baptized at Ephesus had not received the Holy Ghost. He knew that there must be something wrong, for this must follow; but the whole mystery was explained when they told him, they had only been baptized with John’s baptism. “Then they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them.” Acts 19. Paul in his Epistle to Titus, has the same order, “The washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” 2 Titus 3:5. Thus the enjoyment of the influences of the Holy Ghost, and consequently all acceptable worship, are only possible as flowing forth from sacraments. There is no direct coming to Christ, that is acceptable to him, possible on the part of any one who wilfully separates worship from sacraments. Christ demands that his ordinances be honored: and any one who, under the plea of any invitation to come

directly to Him, sets these aside, to bring to him emotions, and prayers, and praises, doing it knowingly, insults instead of pleases Him. He enters not in at the door, and is a thief and robber. Calvin somewhere says truly, 'if God is not bound to his institutions, *we are.*' We challenge Dr. Boardman to bring one respectable theologian from the almost innumerable "cloud of witnesses" that from the Reformation till now bend down over the interests of protestant truth, who does not teach the same thing.

Moreover, the invitations to sinners to come to God, are the same in the Old Testament as in the New. There they were invited to come to God, not through the priests, as though they had personal grace to give, but always through the rites which they celebrated; and their prayers, and worship, were to be heard in virtue of these sacrifices. In the New, there must be a drawing nigh to God by the covenant made and sealed in sacraments; and here is the true basis and warrant of all acceptable worship. The sentiment "that men may come to Christ and be accepted by him, without the intervention of any human mediator," is a far-reaching heresy, setting Christ against his own institutions, and making both the ministry and the sacraments a mere sham—or rather an array of "arrogant assumptions," between Christ and sinners—hindrances instead of helps to grace. It is a blessed thing that even in the Presbyterian Church, yea, even in that Church over which Dr. Boardman presides, the tradition is better and stronger than the theory; and so far from finding their way into heaven "without, the intervention of any human mediator," and the rites which one in his official station alone can administer, there is not one in that fold who has ever found his way into that "Church militant" without such "intervention and mediation."

In the prosecution of his argument, Dr. Boardman gives us the following: "The validity of this argument will further appear, when it is considered that the sacerdotal theory of the Christian ministry is *subversive of all true views of the nature and design of the Church.*"

Now the misfortune is that he gives us no definition of his

theory of the Church. This is the misery of this whole treatise. It is negative. One is reminded on almost every page, of the definition which Satan is made to give of himself in Goethe's *Faustus*:

"Ich bin der Geist der stets verneint!"

We can, however, gather what his idea of the Church is from what he tells us that it is not. Let the following extracts, in which he describes the spurious Church, be seriously pondered. In the beginning of the first extract, the reader will please excuse a somewhat uncourteous strike at the Episcopal Church, after which he will find some things which Dr. Boardman thinks the Church is not:

"It has been repeatedly intimated that the doctrine of an official human priesthood in the Church, is interlaced with a corresponding hypothesis as to the nature and functions of the Church itself. The Church, according to this system, is a Hierarchy. It consists of a single society, (now unhappily in a somewhat divided state,) placed under the government of Diocesan Bishops, who derive their authority from Christ, through an unbroken prelatical succession. These Bishops, indeed, with the inferior clergy, properly *constitute* the Church —the *people* being a mere appendage to the ministry. For the doctrine that the clergy are a priesthood, carries with it the prerogative of exclusive mediation. But to assume to be the only mediators between God and the *Church*, would have been too glaring a usurpation of Christ's office, to be ventured upon in the early stage of this heresy. The *Church*, however, might mediate between God and the *people*, and so the clergy gradually transformed their 'order' into "the Church." To this Church are confided the gifts of salvation. It stands in the place, and is clothed with the authority of Christ, as his Vicar. It is the storehouse of grace, and this grace it communicates through the sacraments, which must be duly administered by sacerdotal hands. In baptism sinners are regenerated, and by the eucharist, in which the faithful partake of the real body and blood of Christ, they have their forgiveness sealed to them."

Again, according to Dr. Boardman's view, the spurious

theory of the Church holds that, "The priesthood being the stewards of the grace deposited in this 'store-house,' they dispense it exclusively through the sacraments."

The powers claimed for the Church in the following extract, are commented upon by the preacher in one flippant sentence of ridicule, thus : " 'Awful and tremendous' these powers are ; and we agree with the writer, that 'if not conferred by God, they are blasphemously assumed by man.' "

Here is the extract: " 'These powers of the Church,' another eminent apologist of the system has observed, 'are very great—they are even awful; if not conferred by God, they are blasphemously assumed by man. The power of communicating to man the divine nature itself, of bringing down the Deity from heaven, of infusing the Spirit into the souls of miserable mortals—this, which is nothing more than the every day promise of the Church, every time that the priest stands at the font, or ministers at the altar—is so awful and so tremendous, that we scarcely dare to read it, except in familiar words which scarcely touch the ear.' "

We do not intend to endorse the views of the Church which are here exhibited in these extracts as spurious, and even ridiculous, in the *form* in which they are set forth ; but we will say, that in setting them aside wholly, Dr. Boardman annihilates all idea of the Church, as fully as he has all conception of the ministry. The very fundamental attributes and powers of the Church are here ridiculed. Let us notice a few.

1. It is here denied that the Church mediates between God and the people.

That the Church mediates between God and man is not only one of the plainest, but also one of the most glorious and consoling truths ever revealed from heaven to earth. To deny it, is not as good as Judaism ; for no Jew ever dreamed of getting to heaven except through "the Church in the wilderness." Even David knew that all saints are "born in her;" and that God "when he writeth up the people" will count only those that were born in her. Ps. 87. Ps. 92: 13.

The Apostle calls the Church "his BODY, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Eph. 1: 23. Col. 1: 24. See also 1

Cor. 12: 12, 13. Eph. 2: 18-22. Eph. 4. What does this favorite figure of the Apostle mean? Where does it place the Church? It represents Christ as the *Head*, the Church as the *Body*, and Saints as *Members* of the body. The members are united with the head only through the mediation of the body. Hence the primitive Christians knew of no Christians separate from the Church. "The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." Acts 2: 47.

The Apostle by one stroke sets this question fully at rest: "Jerusalem which is above is free, WHICH IS THE MOTHER OF US ALL." When Dr. Boardman has once found children who have *no* mother, or who were *before* their mother and constituted her, or who sprang from a father without the mediation of a mother,—then he may go seeking saints who are children of God, united with Christ, and heirs of heaven without the mediation of the Church. But lest the Apostle's words, after the convenient fashion of modern theologians, to whom Church Symbols themselves are treated as figures, should be pronounced "only figurative," and then evaporated into nothing, we will give some words of comment on this figure from JOHN CALVIN, an eminent divine of a past age—a name that has some authority in the Presbyterian Church. In the Institutes of Calvin, a work published by the same "Presbyterian Board of Publication" which has published this sermon, there is a chapter with this heading: "The true Church, and the necessity of our union with her, being the mother of all the pious."* In this chapter, the whole of which we earnestly commend to Dr. Boardman for its richness, Calvin discourses as follows: "But as our present design is to treat of the *visible* Church, we may learn even from the title of *mother*, how useful and even necessary it is for us to know her; since there is no other way of entrance into life, unless we are conceived by her, born of her, nourished at her breast, and continually preserved under her care and government till we are divested of this mortal flesh, and "become like the angels." (Math. 22: 30.) For our infirmity will not admit of our dismission from her school; we

* Calvin's Institutes, Vol. II, p. 220.

must continue under her instruction and discipline to the end of our lives. It is also to be remarked, that out of her bosom there can be no hope of remission of sins, or any salvation."* Let it not be forgotten, that this is said in reference to the *visible* Church, as he distinctly informs us at the beginning of the extract; as though he feared some of his followers, as is only too much the fashion, should evaporate his testimony into spiritual sublimation, by referring his words to an invisible Church, as if *one Church*, visible and invisible, could be separated.

This same Calvin also alludes with approbation to the strong and beautiful sentiment of one of the Fathers, in reference to the absolute necessity of union with the Church in order to salvation: "For it is not lawful to 'put asunder' those things 'which God hath joined together'; that the Church is the mother of all those who have Him for their Father."† Let these awfully solemn words be first branded as heresy, before a Presbyterian Assembly, properly glorying in this great name, endorses the flippant ridicule of the sentence: "The *Church*, however, might mediate between God and the people!"

Again, Calvin holds this strong language: "Nor is it small praise, that the Church is chosen and separated by Christ to be his spouse, 'not having spot or wrinkle,' (Eph. 5: 17) to be 'his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.' Eph. 1: 23. Hence it follows that a departure from the Church is a renunciation of God and Christ. And such a criminal dissension is so much the more to be avoided, because, while we endeavor, as far as lies in our power, to destroy the truth of God, we deserve to be crushed with the most powerful thunders of his wrath. Nor is it possible to imagine a more atrocious crime, than that sacrilegious perfidy, which violates the conjugal relation that the only begotten Son of God has condescended to form with us."‡

But behold a greater than Calvin is here! What will Dr. Boardman say of these words: "The *visible* Church, which is also Catholic, or universal under the Gospel, (not confined to one nation, as before under the law) consists of *all those* through-

* Calvin's Institutes, Vol. II, p. 224. † Idem. p. 221. ‡ Idem. p. 222.

out the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children ; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, *out of which there is no ordinary salvation.*"*

Among the genuine old wine of the first generation of Reformers there is no other voice heard. Any quantity of testimonies could be furnished. Lest Dr. Boardman should think that the Presbyterian Church alone taught this doctrine, we will add one from Dr. Ursinus, to show that the German Reformed Church is equally sound on this point. He meets this question firmly thus : "No one can be saved out of the Church : 1. Because out of the Church there is no Saviour, and hence no salvation. 2. Because those whom God has chosen to the end, which is eternal life, them he has also chosen to the means, which consists in the inward and outward call. Hence although the elect are not always members of the *visible* Church, yet *they all become such before they die.*"†

2. Dr. Boardman, in the above extracts, pronounces that a false view of the Church, which teaches that to it "are confided the gifts of salvation."

This is a heresy as deadly as the one just routed by the help of the Scriptures, Calvin, the Presbyterian Symbols, and Ursinus. The same arguments and testimonies just presented also overturn this erroneous view. For if salvation is only found in the Church, then the gifts of salvation must be confided to her. The same mother that gives spiritual birth to the saints is not without the necessary nourishment. Calvin is severe enough to say, "That all who reject the spiritual food for their souls, which is extended to them by the hands of the Church, deserve to perish with hunger and want."‡

In regard to the word, which is eminently a gift of salvation, Calvin says, "God has deposited this treasure with the Church."|| In regard to the sacraments, he says : "First of all he has instituted Sacraments, which we know by experience to be means

* See Westminster Confession of Faith, Chap. xxi. ii. For the same doctrine, see also Larger Catechism. Ques. 60.

† Ursinus' Commentary on the Heid. Catechism. Translated by the Rev. G. W. Williard. p. 292.

‡ Calvin's Institutes, Vol. II, p. 225. || Idem. p. 221.

of the greatest utility for the nourishment and support of our faith. For as, during our confinement in the prison of our flesh, we have not yet attained to the state of angels, God has, in his wonderful providence, accommodated himself to our capacity, *by prescribing a way in which we might approach him*, notwithstanding our immense distance from him.* The Larger Catechism of the Presbyterian Church, places among other privileges of the visible Church, "the ordinary means of salvation."† Grace and life are all in Christ and from him; and if the Church is "his body," his life and grace must be as certainly only in the Church, as our physical life is in our bodies. As the members of our bodies have life only in the body, so saints have life only in the Church. Hence, what Dr. Boardman sets down as a heresy to be ridiculed, we set down as a most necessary and blessed truth to be believed, and the Scripture, and Calvin, and the Presbyterian Symbols say—Amen: "To the Church are confided the gifts of salvation. It is the store-house of grace."‡

3. Dr. Boardman rejects the doctrine that the gifts of salvation, confided to the Church, as a store-house of grace, "it communicates through the sacraments," and that thereby "they have their forgiveness sealed."

It is a matter of the utmost surprise to us, that any intelligent Presbyterian should reject either of these propositions. Are sacraments *means* of grace? Who denies this? If one thing is plainer than another in the whole tenor of Scriptures, it is that Baptism receives us into a gracious relation to God; "plants" us into the soil of grace; through it we "put on Christ;" it "saveth us" as the ark did Noah: we are "born of water" and the Spirit: it is "the washing of regeneration," according to the Apostle's teaching.§ "By the right use of

* Calvin's Institutes, Vol. II, p. 221.

† Larger Catechism, Ques. 176.

‡ What does this language mean? "Unto this Catholic visible Church, Christ hath given the ministry, the oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, in this life, to the end of the world: and doth by his presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereto." *Westminster Confession, Chap. xxv. iii.*

§ That too low views—lower than the teaching of their Symbols—are alarmingly prevalent in the Presbyterian Church, is beginning to be deeply

this ordinance the grace promised is-not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred."* As to the Lord's Supper it is evidently a nourishing and quickening ordinance, as this is set forth in bread and wine. It is for the "spiritual nourishment and growth in him," unto all "true believers."† "Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, *really* and *indeed*, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all the *benefits of his death.*"‡ Let Dr. Boardman settle that difference between himself and the Symbols of his own Church.

* Westminster Confession, Chap. xxviii, vi. † Idem. Chap. xxix. 1. ‡ Idem. xxix. vii.

felt by many in that communion. In proof of this, we give the following earnest words from the "Presbyterian Critic," Vol. I, No. 10:

"Since the publication of the Minutes of the last General Assembly, a number of curious items have been gathered from the Statistical Tables, by persons skilled in such exercises, and have been sent the rounds of the papers for the edification of the Church. It being one of the objects of this Periodical to call attention to existing facts and doings in the Church, we have taken the trouble to look somewhat closely into the statistics of Baptism, especially of Infants,—a sacrament which, according to our excellent and churchly standard, 'doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ,'—and we deem it of far more importance that the Church should know to what extent this holy ordinance is observed or neglected, than that she should know which are the largest Synods, or who have the largest Churches.

In a Church with a genius and constitution like our own, the Baptism or non-Baptism of the children of the Church, may be safely taken as an index of her internal vital state, at least in certain very important respects. From the relation in which our Confession of Faith makes baptised children to stand to the Church and the covenant of grace, we are warranted in regarding Infant Baptism as the pulse by which to test the soundness of the Church, according to the laws of her own peculiar life. Just in proportion as Infant Baptism falls into disuse, is it a sign that *something* is wrong. It is an evidence that the Church is proving false to her organic constitution and life; is sliding away from her own standards; is loosing from her ancient moorings. Now, if this be true, the statistics of the Church for the present year, may well excite serious inquiry, if not alarm. From an examination of them, it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that in certain portions, and in those the oldest, and in some respects most important portions of the Presbyterian Church, infant baptism is sadly *undervalued* and *neglected*. * * The same thing which we have discovered in the case of certain Synods, we find to be still more surprisingly true in the case of certain Presbyteries and particular churches. The Presbytery of Londonderry reports one baptism (infant) to 64 communicants: the Presbytery of Buffalo city the same; the Presbytery Rochester city, 1 to 46; the Presbytery of Michigan, 1 to 77; the Presbytery of Columbus, 1 to 30. In the Presbytery of New Brunswick, there are three churches which report thus: one reports 848 communicants and 3 baptisms; another reports 340 communicants and 2 baptisms; another reports 315 communicants and 2 baptisms; and there are several others in the same

As to the other point, whether believers "have their forgiveness sealed to them" in the sacraments—who denies this? It is the object of Christ in the sacraments, among other blessings, "to confirm our interest in him."* Baptism is "a sign and seal of remission of sins."† The Lord's Supper is to "true believers" "the sealing all benefits of Christ's death."‡ Calvin asks Dr. Boardman: "And what is there that ought to give any man much offence, if we teach that the promise is sealed by the sacraments?"§

* Westminster Confession, Chap. xxvii. i. † Idem. xxviii. i. ‡ Idem. xxix. i. § Calvin's Institutes, Vol. II. p. 456.

Presbytery not much better. In Philadelphia one church reports 303 communicants and 2 baptisms; another reports 320 communicants and 7 baptisms; another reports 287 communicants and 1 baptism. Such instances might be gathered by the score. Now why is this? * * * Why are pastors and people thus negligent respecting one of the sacraments of the Christian Church? Every effect has its cause, and this thing is not the work of chance. It springs, we are afraid, out of low views,—insufficient, inadequate, unchurchly views of the nature and importance of the ordinance itself. We can imagine no other cause. Parents would not neglect it so amazingly, and require such repeated promptings from faithful pastors,—pastors would not neglect to enforce the duty, if such were not the case. Its high, solemn import, and deep significance, such as it had for the minds of our fathers, as embodied in the Westminster Symbols, and as exhibited in the former practice of the Church, seems to be *dying out* of the minds of the Church of their sons and daughters, and an unsound, un-Presbyterian laxity of opinion and feeling, respecting the ordinance, seems to be taking its place. Those pastors, who are themselves awake to the subject, feel this to be the case among their people. The Church, *in this respect*, does not reflect the teachings of her standards. Her old sacramental and churchly spirit is becoming diluted. In a Church with a scriptural constitution this will always show itself first in the sacramental ordinances. And from this, if not checked, it will invade and undermine the whole frame work of the Church. Nothing, we conceive, is more certain than that if Presbyterianism loses her sacramental and churchly spirit, she will fall a prey to latitudinarianism and rationalism in some of their forms. The canker-worm will eat out her vitals. The prevalent neglect of infant baptism in the Congregational Churches of New England, has long been a well known fact; and it is also well known how rapid have been the inroads of latitudinarianism and rationalism upon them. * * * Brethren in the ministry, are you faithful in this vitally important matter? We have examined this subject in deep earnestness and concern, and to you we commend it. Ponder the tendencies that are to make the future of our beloved Church. Do you ever preach upon the subject of Baptism, except when the peace of your flocks is disturbed by some innovating Baptists? Or is it not important enough for our ordinary ministrations? And when you do preach upon it, are you *more careful to urge* upon your people the nature and significance of the ordinance as "a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, or of remission of sins," (see Con. of Faith, Chap. 28) than to warn them against superstition, by telling them that it is a *mere sign*? Let not the bugbear of Romanism or Episcopacy drive us into an equally fatal error on the opposite side."

A truly devout and earnest spirit—a spirit that has faith to feel the solemn mysteries of the world to come as they lie hidden in the “Church of the first born,” to which “we have come”—must be filled with a reverence that is not too strongly called “awful and tremendous!” The supernatural born into the natural, the heavenly and eternal revealing itself in power and glory in earth and in time, silently transforming men and the world into the image of the heavenly, while the angels bend down and “desire to look into” mysteries which were never seen in heaven; “principalities and powers in heavenly places learning by the Church manifold wisdom” which before they never knew; while all the hosts of heaven shout in joy, as in the progress of the history of the Church, seal after seal is opened, and trump after trump announces new victories, until, when the last shout of triumph is heard over vanquished death and hell, one grand chorus shall fill all heaven, “as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying Alleluia: for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.” Before such powers, now lodged and working in the Church, our faith stands in humble and silent reverence, and says, in the very words ridiculed by Dr. Boardman, which we most fully and devoutly make our own: “These powers of the Church are very great—they are even awful; if not conferred by God, they are blasphemously assumed by man. The power of communicating to man the divine nature itself, of bringing down the Deity from heaven, of infusing the Spirit into the souls of miserable mortals—this, which is nothing more than an every day promise of the Church, every time that the minister stands at the font or ministers at the altar—is so awful and tremendous, that we scarcely dare read it; except in familiar words which scarcely touch the ear!” We envy not the man—we fellowship not, no not for a moment, his orthodoxy—whose tongue falters in pronouncing these words, and to whom they are not as full of devotion as a prayer. Is not the Lord’s Supper, which he administers “a communion” of the saint with the entire Christ, as now divine and human in one, in our nature? Is not baptism the sacrament which is joined by

God's word with the renewing of the Holy Ghost? Is not the Church, with its ordinances, the very form in which God, in Christ, and the Spirit is graciously present with men, through which alone they become partakers of the divine nature?

It is urged as a last argument against the idea of the Christian ministry, combatted in this little book, "that it is fraught with ruin to the souls of men."

So far as this remark applies to the Cultus of the Church of Rome, in its partial suppression of the Prophetic office, and in its allowing an overstraining of the priestly and kingly functions, we acknowledge its force. But in his representations of this evil feature in Romanism, so much precious wheat is blown away with the chaff, that we can as little choose to stand with him, where there is neither wheat nor chaff, as with his antagonists, where wheat lies covered by the chaff. We are not confined—and we are thankful for it—either to the one extreme, with its abuses, or to the other, with its negativeness, its infidelity to Church, its anti-sacramental rationalism, and its cheerless, helpless, and hopeless level with mere nature. It may be true: "It is the lordly pretensions of an ambitious priesthood; which brings the ministry into disrepute, and fills Churches with formalists and hypocrites;" but it is equally true, that it is the promulgation of such views of the Christian ministry as those presented in this sermon, which drives the earnest and serious entirely away from the Church, and chills the hearts of those who remain.

That is a sad sentence, in Dr. Boardman's sermon: "By far other means than these, must the ministry conciliate the respect and confidence of the world." Must then the ministry of Christ conciliate the confidence and respect of the world, by ignoring its truly divine official standing, power and commission, and stepping down upon the democratic level? Did Christ—did the Apostles do so? No, that is a better word: "I magnify my office." Undue respect for the ministry is not the fault of this age. Men are little careful how they "touch the Lord's anointed." Even children catch the spirit of irreverence which surrounds them, and have, in many instances, boldness to manifest in his presence the rudest familiarity.

There must be a cause for this growing spirit of irreverence. Where is it to be found but in the spread of sentiments which disrobe the ministry of its divinely official character? It is to be traced to the sentiment, now heard from many lips, that the minister is a man like other men, losing sight entirely of the fact, that though he is like other men, as a man, he is not so as a minister of Jesus Christ. The solemn words of our Saviour, "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me," are not now remembered in their true solemnity.

If men are to respect and reverence ministers, they must see in them more than themselves—must see the office in the man. They must hear them because they are the commissioned of God; and honor them as those whom Christ has honored. The bitter fruits of this low view of the ministry are beginning to reveal themselves sadly in many of our cities and larger towns. The way in which a minister is at present to command respect and "conciliate the world," is not by his office, but by his learning, his eloquence, his gift to tickle the popular ear. To this end he must be a man of tactics. He must "get up his name." He must "draw crowded houses." He must lay aside the old themes: they are trite. He must rummage the "curiosities of literature," to keep up "freshness and variety." He must preach series of "sermons for the times." He must "encompass land and sea" to find a "striking theme," and then give due notice in a newspaper. If he is "gifted" in a way that will combine all these requisites he may "conciliate the world;" and draw the "lawyers," and the "merchants," and the "prominent men," to hear him. Thus a few will draw attention, not by their official ministry, but by "conciliating" the worst spirit of the world; while the many, either because they have not the key to popular favor, or disdain to prostitute their high and holy office, find the crowd rushing by them and their ministrations, with scarcely a single nod of respect. Would that this picture were not too sadly true! We find the seeds of this noxious growth in just such low views of the sacred office as those promulgated in "*Dr. Boardman on the Christian Ministry.*"

The beautiful plea which is brought in towards the close of this sermon, for "the chartered rights and privileges" of the sacred office is all in vain. It is like green vines over ruins. The misery is in the broken down foundations beneath. It reminds one of striking down a traveller upon the highway, breaking his bones and mangling his body, and then comforting the bleeding victim with music and perfumes!

We close our article by summing up the results of this discussion. We do so by turning all Dr. Boardman's negative propositions into positive ones, in substantially his own language. We stand at opposite poles. We have shown that the view of the Christian ministry against which he contends:

Is in full harmony with the whole structure of the New Testament.

It is in a high degree honorable to the one perfect and unchangeable Priesthood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

It accords with the emphatic teaching of the Scriptures, that no sinner is authorized to come directly to Christ for pardon, without the intervention of an official mediation.

It establishes and confirms all true views of the nature and design of the Church.

It is fraught with good to the souls of men.

The intelligent reader shall decide whether we have established these points against Dr. Boardman's sermon, by Scripture, by Calvin, and by the highest symbolical authority in the Presbyterian Church.

Lancaster, Pa.

H. H.

ART. II.—SKETCHES OF A TRAVELER FROM GREECE, CONSTANTINOPLE, ASIA MINOR, SYRIA AND PALESTINE.**VI. MY TRAVELS IN SYRIA.****II. BA'ALBEK.**

Now call unto me all the prophets of Ba'al, all his servants, and all his priests ; let none be wanting : for I have a great sacrifice to do to Ba'al. And all the worshippers of Ba'al came, and the house of Ba'al was full from one end to another. And Jehu said to the captains and the guard: Go in and slay them, let none come forth ! And they smote them with the edge of the sword, and cast them out, and brought forth the images from the house of Ba'al and burned them, and brake down the temple, and made it a draught-house to this day.—2 KINGS 10: 19-27.

THE distance between Damascus and Ba'albek is eighteen hours, or forty-five miles, and is generally accomplished in two days. The road winds through the valleys and plateaus of Jebel-Zebdany, the northern part of the Anti-Lebanon, a country more fertile and interesting than that through which the traveler passes on the caravan route by Demas. The morning of the 24th of May was cool and agreeable. We left the Italian hotel at an early hour, and following the road through the suburbs and gardens, we, on the height of Salahieh, took our last farewell of the happy plain of Damascus. The ascent above Salahieh is rough and deeply furrowed through the limestone rock. On our left was the pass of Rabah, through which the foaming Burrada forces its passage towards the Ghutah. A frightful precipice, several hundred feet high, here overhangs the glen, to which we descended by a circuitous road ; and in an hour we arrived at the large village of Dummar, where we crossed the river on a stone bridge. The abundance of water which is led off through the gardens by numberless channels, the rich, loamy soil, and the deep indenture of the valley, protected on the north and west by ridges of the Anti-Lebanon, give a tropical luxuriance to the vegetation. Immense plantains, poplars, and fig, walnut, and chest-

nut trees, interlaced with vines, overhang the banks of the river, and continue for miles to form a dense and beautiful grove along the road. But instead of following the sinuosities of Wady-Burrada, we once more crossed the stream, and ascended to the barren and dreary table-land el-Jedid. The wind blew freshly down from the snow-topped Mount Hermon, and we again experienced one of those astonishing transitions in temperature from the Egyptian heat of the valley, to the Alpine chilliness of the plateau. We were surrounded by distant mountains. North-west the high ruddy peaks of Neby-Abel gradually rose on our sight, as we in four hours approached the village el-Huseiniyeh, lying on the steep offset of the mountain, in an elevated position above the valley of the Burrada. On its opposite bank, amidst groves of fruit trees, appeared the convent of el-Kanum and several villages. This place is celebrated in Arab tradition. Cain, say the Arabs, having slain his brother, at the altar of Kashioun, in the Ghutah, north of Damascus, where the first parents then dwelt, took the corpse on his shoulders, and not knowing what to do with his brother, whose profound sleep did not yield to his exertions to awaken him, he wandered lamenting along the banks of the river. There he saw a raven scraping, with his beak, a hole in the earth, in which he buried one of his own species; and this suggested to Cain the idea, that the rigid sleep of his brother required a different couch from usual. He then dug a grave on the mountain as a resting place for the dead. A monument on the top of the mountain was supposed to be the tomb of Abel.

After an hour's delay at the mill of el-Huseiniyeh, we continued our route between the mountain and the steep bank of the river, and soon arrived at the highly romantic pass of Suk-Wady-Burrada. In the very mouth of the defile are situated two villages in an elevated position above the river, which runs between them. The houses on both sides stand grouped on terraces descending rapidly to the channel of the boiling and foaming river below. Through a dark and narrow street, the only passage, we turned to the left and arrived at the strait of the pass Suk-Burrada, where an arched stone bridge crosses

over to the left bank. Bare and cleft rocks of an immense altitude inclosed us on all sides, and only a narrow path on the river side, where a few resolute men might stop a whole army, led northward through the defile to the open plain of Zebdany. On the precipitous flanks of the mountains are many sepulchral chambers excavated in the rock, which seem inaccessible without the application of ropes and scaling ladders. The portals of these sepulchres or Troglodytic dwellings are ornamented with columns and mutilated statues in relief. Near the bridge is a staircase cut in the rock, and many fragments of columns and square blocks are scattered about. This appears to have been the *necropolis* or cemetery of the ancient city of Abila, which in antiquity defended the pass of the Chrysorhoas. It was the residence of the *tetrarchs* or princes of Abilene, a principality extending over the Anti-Lebanon, and the northeastern parts of Palestine, together with the Auranitis (Hauran) and the plain of Damascus. Herod the Great afterwards took possession of the southern districts of Abilene, while Lysanias the tetrarch, was circumscribed to the northern part of the Anti-Lebanon. Abila was a strong fortress in a nearly impregnable position.* Interesting ruins of the castle, of an ancient temple, and other large structures, are still to be seen on the summit of the mountain above the pass, and have, no doubt, given rise to the Arabian name and tradition of Neby-Abel.

It was a pleasant afternoon. The deep shadows of the barren, reddish-brown precipices in the depth of the defile, and the brilliantly illuminated heights, rearing their peaks in strange and fantastic forms against the azure sky above, rendered the Suk-Burrada the most sombre and wild-looking, but at the same time the most picturesque spot we had yet seen in the whole range of the Anti-Lebanon; and we would have been glad to stop in the village, if we had not expected to find still better quarters among the hospitable Christians of the pretty little town of Zebdany further on in the plain.

We now arrived at the northern opening of the pass; the

* St. Luke 3: 1; Joseph. Antiq. Jud. 20: 7; 17: 11; 19. 5. The city was called *Abila of Lysanias*, to distinguish it from another of the same name, situated on the banks of the Hieromax in Persia.

mountains at once receded, and a verdant, well-cultivated plain extended before us. Here the Burrada flowing in a broad and quiet bed from the upper plain, forms a beautiful waterfall and rushes chafing and roaring into the deep, rocky, channel of the glen.

We now left the muleteers with the luggage behind, and pressed on at full speed on a broad, level road, which appeared to be in as good a condition as any on the continent of Europe. It runs among fields of maize, dhuura, and wheat, inclosed with hedges of briar-roses, hawthorn, or sycamores, often interspersed with poplars and fruit-trees. This sight is so rare in the East, and so contrary to the usages of its indolent inhabitants, that I almost fancied myself transported back to the rural scenery of England or Germany. The landscape became more and more cheerful and animated ; herds of cattle and sheep were grazing on the banks of the Burrada ; Mudaya, Ba'a-in, and other hamlets were here and there situated on the distant heights of Jebel-Zebdany. Nowhere in the Anti-Lebanon does the traveler meet with so much industry and prosperity as in this happy plain, which forms, as it were, an oasis of verdure among its bleak and desert regions. The inhabitants till their fields by oxen ; they stable their cattle during winter, and irrigate their orchards by artificial ditches, which they lead across the fields with much labor and expense. The gardens now thickened to a forest, and beneath a canopy of pear and walnut trees, we entered es-Zebdany, the principal town of the plain. It has a delightful situation on the banks of the small river Zebdany, which a few miles below unites with the Burrada. Our Arabs told us that there was no caravan-serai in the village. Since the destruction of Ba'albek there is but little communication between Damascus and the northern coast of Syria by the valley of Zebdany. We, therefore, stopped at the house of the Sheik Heby Tall, a kind-looking old man, with a snow white beard floating over his bosom. He received us with the courteous "*Marash-ba-bik, Hawadjes !*"—Welcome to you, gentlemen!—and presently offered us a small, dark, but clean room, opening on the court and garden in the rear of the house. Our drivers soon came

up with the sumpters, and all was now bustle and activity in the quiet house of the old sheik. According to my custom, I ordered my own tent to be pitched beneath the peach-trees in the garden, because I always preferred to spend the cool and fragrant nights *a la belle étoile*. The sheik's house stood near the bank of the rivulet, which winds through the village, and is led off through the gardens around. In front of the house the stream forms a small cove, overhung by immense knotty and far-spreading plantains, where a wooden platform, covered with carpets and cushions in the Oriental style, has been raised in the river on piles fixed in its bed. This is a charming place, where the worthy sheik would often pass the sultry hours of the day, smoking his nargiles, and enjoying the refreshing coolness and pleasant murmurs of the brook. Here, too, we received the visits of the well-dressed and good-natured villagers, who were as inquisitive as the Maronites of Mount Lebanon, but less ignorant and troublesome.

Heby-Tall was an intelligent and talkative man. He told me that his family for many years had ruled this village, containing six hundred souls, and some other districts of the plain. He bitterly complained of the exactions of the Turkish Governor of Damascus, though he appeared to have suffered still more during the military occupation of Ibrahim-Pasha, by the continual forays of his troops, quartered in the neighboring plain of Ba'albek. The morning of the 25th of May was fresh and lovely. The atmosphere was filled with the perfume of the small yellow flowers of the oleaster or *zizyphus*, as the Greeks call it, which fences the gardens all around the village. The sheik took me to the terrace of the house where the silk worms are kept, the raw silk of which is a principal source of revenue to the inhabitants of Zebdany. The view over the plain and distant mountain was most delightful. The sun had just risen above the steep and rugged Kurun-es-Zebdany, or "the horns," and skirting the broad valley on the east, glowed on the huge snow-capped crest of the majestic Hermon, soaring high above all the nearer ridges on the south. On our return, Mustapha had served our excellent breakfast, consisting of coffee, fresh milk, eggs, and hot cakes, beneath the fruit-trees of the garden, while the muleteers were preparing for departure.

Taking leave of our hospitable landlord, we continued our route in a northern direction towards the last ridges of the Anti-Lebanon and the valley of Ba'albek. We followed the banks of the Zebdany river, which we at the time supposed to be the Burrada ; but we learned on the road that this river has its head-source in the western mountains, at a distance of three miles from the village. We then approached the rugged Kuru-n-es-Zebdany, where a stream forms a fine waterfall, descends foaming and splashing into the valley below, drives several water-mills, and joins its more quiet companion in the plain. In an hour we ascended to the high table-land of el-Sorgheria, and passed another well-built village, surrounded, like Zebdany, by mulberry groves, orchards, and cultivated fields. It lies on the water-shed of the Anti-Lebanon, four thousand feet above the level of the Mediterranean, though according to appearance, several ridges seem to divide it from the plain of Ba'albek. Before us on the north lay the blooming valley of Yafufeh, to which we now descended through a steep and romantic pass. Another copious brook here forms a cascade ; and following the sinuosities of the mountains, it forces its passage through a gap in the western ridge, and discharges itself in the Litany, (Leontes,) near el-Merdj, on the caravan route to Beirut. The Wady-Yafufeh soon straitened to a narrow dell, encompassed by precipitous, dark-colored rocks. The river flowed through a thicket of plantains, willows, and poplars, which often blocked up our passage, and forced us in many places to ford the stream. In an hour and a half, we at last emerged from the forest on a small and verdant plain, in front of the last high and rocky barrier of the Anti-Lebanon, overhanging the plain of Ba'albek. This last mountain-belt burst upon us quite unexpectedly, as we had anticipated an easy descent to the Buka'a, but now, to our astonishment, found another barren and rugged ridge before us. The sun was extremely hot in this *cul-de-sac*, and our horses were so much jaded from the long and toilsome passage through the copse-wood, that we encamped beneath the trees at a short distance from the ruinous and abandoned village of Yafufeh. The whole distance from the plateau of Sorgheria down to the

Buka'a is uninhabited, and we did not meet a single human being on the road.

In the afternoon we climbed the steep ascent on our right. The path ran in sharp and short turns to a considerable height. The summit was bleak and bare, appeared as if rent by an earthquake, and was strewn over with immense detached rocks, between which a most lovely view opened upon the broad valley of the Buka'a and the more distant Lebanon. Light fleecy clouds were covering the summits of Jebel-Sunnin; yet, far off in the north-west, the huge Jebel-Makmel pierced boldly through the vapors hanging round its flanks, and pointed out to us the direction of our route to the cedar-forest and the city of Tripolis. The nearer offsets of the Anti-Lebanon cut off the prospect towards Ba'albek, but the lower plain, with the silver stripe of the river Litany winding along its verdant fields, was distinctly visible for many miles.

There is a highly remarkable difference in the aspect of these two parallel mountain-ridges. Some of the higher regions of the Anti-Lebanon are covered with forests, while those of Lebanon are totally bare. The general outline of the former is nearly uniform, except on the *south*, where the gigantic Jebel-es-Sheik, forming in reality the central mass of both ridges, rises high above the loftiest summits of the Lebanon, being elevated more than nine thousand feet above the level of the Mediterranean. Its huge *dome* is covered with snow during the greater part of the year, and in its chasms this never disappears. This mountain forms the most striking object in the scenery of Syria. It is seen far off on the sea and from Mount Garizim in Samaria, at a distance of more than eighty miles. It appears as an immense giant, stretching forth towards the north both his mighty arms, the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. The direct breadth of the latter is only one day's journey on the caravan route by Demas, though the more circuitous road along the Burrada to Ba'albek is double that length. The western slope of the Anti-Lebanon towards the Buka'a is steep, and in some places precipitous. The eastern, on the contrary, forms a succession of narrow plateaus, which are furrowed by fertile valleys, and descend gradually down to the

plain of Damascus, the last terrace, whose numerous streams lose themselves in the desert.

The Lebanon, on the contrary, has quite a different physiognomy. Throughout its full length from north to south, it presents a high barrier, terminating in a narrow and sharp ridge of a grayish lime-stone, which on both sides, towards the plain of the Buka'a and the Mediterranean, has a very steep descent. All its lateral valleys are deeper and more narrow than those of the Anti-Lebanon, and its culminating point, Jebel-Makmel, having an elevation of seven thousand feet, is situated near its *northern* boundary, while the Jebel-es-Sheik rises on the *south*; and the whole ridge of the Anti-Lebanon gradually sinks down northward to the sandy plain of Homs, where it disappears altogether.

While contemplating this grand and beautiful landscape from the heights of the Jebel-es-Zebdany, a thunder-storm had gathered on the opposite heights of Mount Lebanon. The thunder began to roll, and the blue lightning flashed incessantly through the sombre clouds, which had now gathered in heavy masses around the snow-capped peaks of Jebel-Makmel. The tempest moved across the valley and threatened every moment to burst against the precipitous rocks of the Anti-Lebanon, on which we were standing. We therefore hastened our descent along a zigzag path, conducting us in a quarter of an hour to Neby-Sheet, a small village, inhabited by Metawileh Muslims, situated on the slope of the mountain, immediately above the plain of Ba'albek. The thunder-storm had now reached the side of the mountain; one clap followed another, and the rain began to pour down like a deluge, when we arrived at the door of the Arab sheik. The poor man seemed quite embarrassed at our sudden appearance, as his house was occupied by some Turkish officers, who were going to Damascus. But all difficulties were instantly removed. The Ottoman Bimbashis politely offered us their room during our short halt, and while the storm was raging outside, drenching our mules and baggage, we were quite comfortably reposing on the divans among the arms and accoutrements of the Turks. The indefatigable Mustapha, in the mean time, prepared our dinner; and when

the thunder-shower had passed over, we, in the refreshing coolness of the evening, continued our descent to the plain. Yet sunset overtook us at two hours' distance from Ba'albek; we, therefore, took up our quarters for the night at the village of Bereitan, situated on a spur of the Anti-Lebanon, commanding a beautiful view towards the plain and the opposite range of the Lebanon. This village is likewise inhabited by Metawileh, whose low, mud-walled houses were clustering on the steep sides of the hill in such a manner, that the *flat roofs* of one range formed the *street* of that above. The villagers, men, women, and children, came thronging around, and followed us to the sheik, who assigned us one of the best houses in the village. The inquisitiveness of the crowds around became now very troublesome, when a handsome young Arab, gaily dressed, and accompanied by some well-equipped horsemen, came galloping up to us, announcing himself as Sidi-Mahmudh, the son of the Emir of Ba'albek. When he saw the despair of Mustapha at not being able to pitch the tents and arrange the baggage, owing to the vexatious curiosity of the idlers around, and the impertinence of the urchins of the village, even beginning to fling stones at the Frank travelers, he threw himself from his horse, and with his whip soon cleared the avenues. He then politely told me that the Emir, his father, invited me to see him at the Kula'at—the castle. Taking Mustapha with me, I went to the outskirts of the village, where I found the Emir sitting on a carpet before an old tower, smoking his *nargiles*. He was surrounded by four or five handsome Arabs, whose glittering arms and splendid dress contrasted most strikingly with the squalidness and misery of the rest of the inhabitants. The young warriors wore large white turbans, light blue jackets, and trousers richly laced with gold; and their beautiful steeds, as gaudily accoutred as their riders, were picketed in the adjoining court-yard. The present Emir of Ba'albek is Mar-Kandjar, of the old family of Harfush, who were the feudal lords of the Buka'a, and nearly as independent as the chiefs of Mount Lebanon. Mar-Kandjar is a venerable-looking man, with a flowing white beard and a shrewd countenance. He enjoys the reputation of being a brave

warrior. The followers of Ali were defeated and almost annihilated during their bloody feuds with the Druzes of Mount Lebanon, as I mentioned in another place. Their beautiful plain was afterwards ravaged by the army of Ibrahim-Pasha, who had quartered the wild tribes of his Bedouin cavalry in the environs of Ba'albek. At last, in 1840, when the Anglo-Austrian fleet appeared on the coast, and Turkish proclamations called on all the mountaineers to revolt against the Egyptians, Emir Mar-Kandjar again armed the bands of his daring horsemen, who were still dispersed among the villages of the Anti-Lebanon, and uniting with the Druzes and Maronites, attacked the retreating Egyptian army and contributed his part to expel it from the country.

It seemed to me as if those handsome young horsemen, the sons of the Emir, were the last of that enterprising people, who, with thousands of warriors, had swept the plain and extended their conquests to the coasts of the sea. I wondered that the old Emir offered me coffee, a pipe, and a seat on his divan, which are rather unusual compliments with the fanatic M^tawileh, as all travelers assert that they never invite strangers of another belief, nor think it proper even to touch vessels or utensils used by them. But the late war and the continual intermixture with European travelers have done away with many prejudices, and begun essentially to change the manners of the East. Mar-Kandjar bade us welcome to his country, and told me that we might at our leisure and with perfect safety visit the monuments of Ba'albek. He then drew forth from his girdle an English telescope, a present which he had received during the war from his British allies, and requested me to put the glasses in order.

Early next morning, the 26th of May, we departed from Bereitan, and descending to the plain, took a northern direction to Ba'albek. Ridges of swelling hills, the last undulations of the Anti-Lebanon on our right, still for a while cut off our view in front; but on our crossing the last height, the stately temple-ruins in their commanding elevation, like a Gothic castle of the middle ages, and the white dwellings of Ba'albek, with its shattered mosques and broken minarets, now appeared

above the surrounding grove at a distance of three miles. Nearer, on our left, was seen a circular ruin supported by columns, on a hill behind the village of Duris. We then arrived at the ancient quarries, where the immense blocks of hard limestone had formerly been excavated for the foundations of the temples. Many stones lie perfectly formed for use ; others are half cut out from the mountain ; and a huge rock, seventy feet in length, though not yet detached from the quarry, is shaped off in an oblong form, and seems to have been designed for the substructure of the larger temple. The city of Ba'albek now lay before us at a short distance. The ancient city walls, which were defended by large square towers, are demolished ; but large heaps of stones and dilapidated turrets still indicate their direction along the eastern heights, and their northward curve inclosing the town. A clear, purling brook, descending from the fountain-head of Rasel-Ain, a couple of miles north of the city, passes around the base of the castle, and taking a south-western course through the plain, discharges itself in the Litany. This rivulet and a scattered grove of walnuts, willows, poplars and plantains covering its banks and the environs of the temples, highly contributed to enhance the beauty of the scenery ; nor is it possible to describe the pleasant sensations it at once called forth. Here we instantly dismounted, and ordering Mustapha to take our horses and attendants to the Greek convent in the town, we crossed the rivulet, and ascended to the temples.

They form together with the spacious courts, sanctuaries and porticoes, an *entire acropolis*, elevated on an oblong platform, which extends twelve hundred feet in its longest diameter from east to west. The foundations of this platform consist, in some places, of gigantic freestones, between sixty and seventy feet in length. In their enormous dimensions and the similarity of their workmanship, they have a striking resemblance to the substructions of the great platform of the ancient Jewish temple on Mount Moriah at Jerusalem, and thus seem to corroborate the old tradition of the Orientals, Christians as well as Mohammedans, of their having been a work of the times of Solomon, King of Judah and Israel, who built Hamath

and Tadmor in the desert. The outer wall on the north is admirably preserved; it is thirty feet in height. It runs parallel with the platform of the temples, and incloses a deep court or moat, two hundred feet in length, and forty-five in breadth, which is supposed to have served as a *vivarium* or inclosure for the wild beasts, who were kept for the worship of Ba'al, the Sun-god, and even in later times, for the cruel combats of the sight-loving Romans.* These lions' dens remind us of those kept by the kings of Media and Babylonian in the times of the prophets. The Saracens, after the conquest of Damascus in 636, strongly fortified the temples of Ba'albek. The outer walls were raised higher and strengthened by battlements; on the east, the principal entrance and portico were walled up and flanked by square towers. During the crusades, Ba'albek was bravely defended by the Saracens, and the Christian knights never succeeded in permanently establishing themselves in the Buka'a. It is, therefore, very probable that these early fortifications, and their elevated and strong position, may have saved the temples from that destruction to which other more exposed monuments have so frequently been subjected. Indeed this Saracenic military architecture of square and octagonal towers, with pointed arches and battlemented pinnacles, though in opposition to the more gigantic and graver monuments of Imperial Rome, do not a little contribute to the inexpressibly picturesque and romantic effect which the castle, as a whole, makes on the beholder on his first approach.

The principal entrance was from the city on the east, but it is at present obstructed and closed up by the more modern walls. In front of it was the first or hexagonal court, which is now very ruinous; but the larger quadrangular or inner court is in better preservation. From thence the prospect opens upon the remaining columns of the immense Pantheon, directly in front, and the smaller, but wonderfully preserved temple of Ba'al farther off to the left, while the distant snow-clad ridge

* Lucian, describing the temple of Juno in Hieropolis, says: "In the court of the temple are kept a great number of bears and lions, which feed together, and are never known to attack or hurt any one; being set apart for the sacred rites, they are always tame." Lucian, de Dea Syr.

of Jebel-Makmel forms a glorious background to this beautiful picture. Both courts present a series of large recesses, alternately square and circular, which seem to have been designed for sanctuaries, and schools of the philosophers and priests, who perhaps had their dwellings in the chambers which are distributed at the angles of the courts.* They are all enriched with architectural decorations, with porticoes of four or six columns, tabernacles for busts and elegantly ornamented niches for statues, while a beautiful frieze of bull's heads and wreaths of flowers and fruits, with a boldly projecting cornice above, gives union and firmness to the whole structure.

Over heaps of rubbish and broken columns, nearly hid among luxuriant shrubs and flowers, we forced our way to the great Pantheon, which according to an inscription on the exterior portico was dedicated to Jove and the great gods—*diis magnis*. This then was the magnificent temple built by Antoninus Pius about the middle of the second century of our era. John of Antioch says, that it was dedicated to Jove and considered one of the wonders of the world. It appears to have been a *decastyle*, with ten columns in the pronaos and posticum, and nineteen in each of its flanks, after the Roman manner; the whole number being fifty-four. The height of the columns is sixty feet, exclusive of the architrave, and with it seventy-two; their diameter seven feet; and the dimensions of the temple were two hundred and ninety feet in length by one hundred and sixty in breadth.† No vestige of the cell or body of the temple now remains. Only six beautiful columns of the rich Corinthian order, forming part of the southern peristyle, are still standing. The others were thrown down by an earthquake in 1759; their bases may be seen on the platform, while the

* "A great number of priests wait in the temple, some of whom slay the victims, others pour out the libations: some are called *fire-bearers*, others attendants on the altar. When I was there above a hundred of them assisted at the sacrifice. Their garments were white, and they had hats on their heads, except the high priest, who is clothed in purple and wears a tiara: he changes every year." *Lucian de Dea Syr.*

† The Olympeion at Athens was larger, being a *dipteros decastylos*, with one hundred and twenty-eight columns of the Corinthian order. It measured three hundred and fifty-four by one hundred and seventy-two feet; the shaft of the remaining columns is sixty feet, and their diameter seven and a half feet.

shafts have rolled down below. The columns have not only preserved their Corinthian capitals, but even their architrave and a highly elaborate cornice. They consist of two or three blocks of a red and black granulous granite, and are so perfectly joined together that their junction can scarcely be discovered. These gigantic ruins stand on an elevated platform on the north-western angle of the castle-wall, where three immense blocks of sixty-five feet in length seem to have excited the admiration of ancient as well as modern writers.*

At the distance of fifty yards stands the second temple, supposed to be that of Ba'al, the Sun-god. It was not inclosed within the great court, and forms now the south-western corner of the castle; the Saracens having fortified it like the courts and porticoes with towers and battlements, and a strong traverse, which obstructs the view to the elegant door-way on the eastern front. This temple is still in excellent preservation. It had sixteen Corinthian columns, forming a double row on its eastern and western fagades, and a peristyle of fifteen on each side, making in all fifty-four, of which twenty-three, with their epistylia, are standing at the present day; while the bases and lower frusta of many others are either indicating their place or lying in wild confusion around the platform.

The outer row of six Corinthian columns on the eastern portico, the principal entrance, is demolished, and its fragments cover the broad staircase leading up to the temple. But the second colonade is entire, and presents the highly remarkable feature, that the *corner columns* on the sides are *fluted*, while the six central shafts are plain. One column, perhaps overthrown by an earthquake, is still leaning *unbroken* against the southern wall of the cell, thus proving the extraordinary solid-

* These blocks are sixteen feet in breadth and thirteen feet in height. Such an enormous mass contains, according to Professor Russegger, fourteen thousand five hundred and twenty cubic feet, and weighs about one million two hundred thousand pounds.

The Chronicon Alexandrinum, page 303, says that Theodosius converted the great and renowned sanctuary at Heliopolis, that of the *Three Stones*, *τριπλάσιον*, into a Christian Church. This epithet, no doubt, had reference to the immense substructions of the great Pantheon, thus distinguishing it from the smaller temple of Ba'al.

ity and skill with which the ancient architects united the shafts of their columns. The elevation of column and capital is fifty-one feet, eight inches ; the diameter five feet. The temple is two hundred and thirty feet in length and one hundred and sixty in breadth.

It is composed of a glossy white limestone, quite resembling marble, which in the course of time has assumed that beautiful golden hue, so well suited to enhance the picturesque effect of ancient architecture in the warm coloring of a Syrian sky.

The roof of the temple has fallen in ; but the coffers of the peristyle—the *lacunaria*—are still lying in their places, and are ornamented with quite a variety of portraits of Roman Emperors and entire figures from the Grecian mythology, such as Leda caressing the swan, Jove with Ganymede, and Diana armed with bow and arrows. The high door-way on the eastern front leading into the body of the temple is twenty-five feet high by twenty feet broad. Its mouldings and ornaments are of an exquisite and exuberant workmanship, representing beautiful *genii* among wreaths of fruits and flowers. On the lintel, in excellent bas-relief, is seen an eagle with expanded wings grasping a caduceus in his talons, and holding in his beak the joined ends of two rich garlands, each of which at the other end is held by a winged victory. At the tremendous earthquake in 1759, the keystone of the lintel forming the eagle gave way, and sinking down eight inches it again became fixed, and is still seen hanging in this threatening position.

The interior of the *cell* is in better preservation than that of any temple I saw in Greece or Italy. It is well known that the only Greek temples which have preserved their cells are those of the Olympian Jove at Akragas, in Sicily, of the Theseum and Parthenon at Athens, and of the Appollo Epicurius in Arcadia, in which latter we still admire the beautiful half-columns in the interior. But in the temple of the Sun in Ba'albek, the four immense *pilasters* of the corners and the twelve fluted three-quarter Corinthian columns, with the intervening niches and tabernacles, surmounted by a rich and elegant entablature adorning the inner wall, give a more distinct idea of the interior cell of an ancient heathen temple ; while at the

western extremity, the *adyton*, is seen the raised stage with its arch or canopy, supported by two Corinthian columns, which seem to indicate the marble couch—the sacred *thalamos*—in which the symbol of Ba'al was screened from the gaze of the adoring multitude.

The worshippers of the Sun-god, who from all parts of the eastern world flocked by thousands to Emesa and Ba'albek to offer their precious oblations at the shrine of Ba'al, says Herodian, the historian, had no engraven image, *χωροποληγον εικόνα*, no statue of a human form representing their deity, like the Greeks and Romans. Ba'al was worshipped under the name *Helagabal*, the procreating god, in the form of a black conical stone, which it was believed had fallen from heaven into the sanctuary of the great temple at Emesa. The color and general appearance of this stone, and the tradition of its having fallen from heaven, evidently proved it to have been a meteorite. The Emperor Heliogabalus afterwards carried it with him to Rome.

Grecian architecture had been my favorite study during a residence of several years at Athens; and my conceptions, therefore, of the monuments of Syria were not very great. Yet, summoning up the different impressions left on my mind from the contemplation of the gigantic architecture of Ba'albek, I must confess that it by far exceeded my expectations in the comparatively pure taste and excellent workmanship of the ornaments and the imposing grandeur of the masses; though it would be improper of course to compare monuments of the age of the Antonines, when the Roman architecture was fast verging to its decline, with the master-pieces of the glorious days of Greece. The noble monuments of the Periclean era stand to this day alike *unrivalled* in their different characters of varied excellence—the most tasteful elegance combined with the most pleasing simplicity—and the vast superiority of the Pentelic marble to the limestone of the Anti-Lebanon! I will, nevertheless, readily subscribe to the judgment of a distinguished traveler, who observes with regard to the temples of Ba'albek, that their architecture, though groaning beneath the weight of its own luxuriance and exhibiting in the numerous

chapels, niches, friezes and cornices, a display of that minutely finished workmanship, which, neglecting the noble proportions of Hellenic construction, betrayed the decline of art among Greeks and Romans—still leaves a deep and pleasing impression on the traveler, and fascinates his eyes alike by the grandeur of the forms, the exquisite finish of the details, and highly picturesque effects of the general scenery.

All travelers describe the ruins of Ba'albek as superior to those of Palmyra and Gerasa.

On our return we passed through the subterranean vaults which run beneath the large platform, supporting the sanctuaries and the courts. They are built of immense square stones, and are two hundred paces in length and twenty-five in breadth, and communicate with each other by passages. Large apertures for the admittance of air from above, render them dry and cool; and from this cause they were formerly used as an armory and magazine by the Saracens, though they are now neglected and so much obstructed by rubbish and stones, that we had some difficulty in finding our way through their dark recesses to the moat of the castle.

On the south-east of the temples towards the city of Ba'albek, stands a circular building with six projecting columns of the Corinthian order, which support a curious cornice, ornamented with Cupids, holding garlands of flowers and fruits.—This little rotunda, which may have belonged to the famous ancient temple of Venus Astarte, the powerful Syrian goddess, was surmounted by a cupola; part of its arched soffit still remains. It is of a white marble or limestone. The workmanship is excellent, but the taste of its architecture very bad, and so affected and odd that it involuntarily reminded me of the *rococo* style of the age of Louis XIV, in France. The Greeks formerly used it as a Christian church, having dedicated it to the Santa Barbara; but since the earthquake of 1759, it is in a tottering condition.

At noon we returned to the Greek convent, inhabited by the bishop, the only Christian minister in Ba'albek. A few rooms, open and airy, with a delightful view towards the temples, the plain, and the distant Mount Lebanon, had been provided for us, and Mustapha now attended with an excellent dinner.

In the afternoon we took a ride through the desolate city of Ba'albek, which, nearly abandoned to decay, still exhibits traces of its former importance. Its ruinous mosque, with broken minarets and sunken cupola, has a fine portico of red granite columns ; its tanks, fountains, and baths are desolate, and the dark cypresses in the courts seem still to mourn over the fate of the devoted city.

The early history of Ba'albek or Heliopolis, is enveloped in almost impenetrable darkness. David, King of Judah, conquered Damascus and held the sway of Syria. Solomon was said to have built Ba'albek and Tadmor (Palmyra) in the desert.* Heliolatry, or worship of the Sun-god, existed there, says Macrobius, in the most remote antiquity ; yet the most flourishing period of these cities, the time of the erection of the gorgeous temples, and of the power and wealth of the proud priesthood of Ba'al in Heliopolis, Emesa, and Palmyra, falls within the first two centuries of our era. Syria had then an exceedingly large population, and was full of rich and flourishing cities. Gaza, Ascalon, and Ptolemais, were celebrated mercantile ports. Aelia Capitolina, the venerable Jerusalem, though interdicted to the exiled Jews, began slowly to recover from its destruction, and was re-built by Hadria. All professions, which required talent, ingenuity, and practice, were flourishing in Syria, and her intelligent and enterprising sons were dispersed over every part of the Roman Empire. The most distinguished musicians, stage-actors, mimics, and dancers, were found in Cæsarea, Tyre, Berytos, and Heliopolis. Laodicea was proud of her inimitable horsemen ; Lydda of her purple-dyers. The Syrian linen manufactures vied with those of Egypt. Gaza and Ascalon enjoyed the greatest export of wines and fruits. Science and philosophy flourished in Tarsus and Berytos, where the young Romans crowded the celebrated colleges of law and jurisprudence. The beautiful and populous Antioch was the proud capital of the East, while Tyre and Sidon still exhibited the wealth, ease, and luxury of their more golden days. Emesa and Heliopolis were the great centre of

* And Solomon built Gezer and Beth-horon the nether, and *Baalath* and Tadmor in the wilderness.—1 Kings, 9: 17, 18.

the worship of the Sun-god, and nowhere was Oriental beauty more admired than in the charming priestesses of the great temple of Venus Astarte here in Ba'albek. The victorious campaigns of Trajan in Mesopotamia, the destruction of the Parthian empire, and the re-opened commerce with the countries beyond the Euphrates and Tigris, contributed to the sudden rise of Palmyra, that wonderful city of the desert, which, by her impregnable situation, and the talents of her great rulers, Odenathus and Zenobia, soon formed an independent and powerful empire on the banks of the Euphrates.

This period of two centuries and a half, when all the beautiful countries around the shores of the Mediterranean were consolidated in the well organized and mighty Roman empire, is generally considered as that of the highest civilization in antiquity; and the peaceful reign of the Antonines, (A. D. 117-180) as the most *happy era* of mankind. And yet—bright, glorious, and peaceful as these times may appear—they were those of the deepest corruption and grossest superstition! History does not present us a picture of greater depravity and degradation among the proud Romans, than that of the triumphal entry of the monster Heliogabalus and his sun-priests into Rome in 218.

When the rebellious legions of Syria, says the interesting Greek historian, Herodian, had raised the high priest of the sun, Bassianus, the son of Soemias, to the imperial throne, the beautiful and vain youth immediately took the sacred name of *Heliogabal* himself, and the triumph of the god of Ba'albek, over all the religions of the world, became the great object of his fanatical zeal and superstitious gratitude. In a solemn and glittering procession he entered the city of Rome. The way was strewed with gold-dust, and the *black stone*, the symbol of Ba'al, set in precious jewels, was placed on a chariot drawn by six white steeds, richly harnessed. The young pontiff held the reins, and, supported by his sun-priests, was drawn slowly backwards that he might continually enjoy the divine presence! A magnificent temple had been built on the Palatine Mount, where sacrifices were celebrated to the Sun-god with all the pomp and extravagance of the East. The most extraor-

dinary victims and the choicest aromatics were consumed on his altars, around which beautiful Syrian maidens performed their graceful dances; while the gravest personages of the Roman state and army, clothed in the long flowing robes of the Phœnicians, officiated in the meanest functions with affected zeal, but their hearts burning with secret indignation! Thus the high priest of Ba'al was the ruler of the world! But the reign of superstition and Asiatic extravagance and perversion was of short duration. The most influential revolution in the spiritual progress of mankind was at hand. The Christian Church had developed itself in its primitive obscurity, and in spite of poverty, contempt, and persecution, had spread throughout Orient and Occident. The Christians were particularly numerous in Antioch, and in all Syria. Constantine ordered the glittering temples of Ba'albek and Emesa to be closed. The re-action was complete, and—although paganism, during the short reign of Julian the apostate, again raised its banner, and the worshippers of Ba'al, at Heliopolis, once more abused the transient moments of their prosperity—nevertheless the final victory of the Christian faith was triumphantly proclaimed by Theodosius the Great.

The pompous sacrifices at the altars of Ba'al then ceased, the priests vanished, and the zealous Christian rulers of the Church now no longer contented themselves with the shutting of the temples, the seizure of the instruments of idolatry, and the abolition of the privileges of the priesthood, but began a pitiless war, of destruction against the most beautiful monuments of Grecian antiquity. In Syria, Marcellus, the bishop, animated with apostolic fervor, says Sozomenos, the historian, took the field against "the powers of darkness," and accompanied by a numerous troop of soldiers and gladiators, attacked with fire and sword the pagan villages and the stately temples of the diocese of Apamea. Idols, columns, and sanctuaries, now went down in a common ruin; the most precious monuments of ancient art perished, and the temples of Ba'albek, no doubt, would have shared the same fate, if Theodosius, himself an admirer and protector of architecture, had not interposed his powerful commands, and ordered the Syrian fanat-

ics to desist. The great pantheon and the temple of Ba'al were thus preserved and transformed into Christian churches. One hundred and forty-six years later came the Saracens. The Christian sanctuaries of Heliopolis, which by the Arabs again was called by its ancient Syrian name Ba'albek, became the residence of an Emir, and were built up into a strong fortress, which repelled all the predatory incursions of the Crusaders in the plain of the Buka'a. The terrible Timour-Khan, with his Mongols, stormed and took Ba'abek in 1401, on his march to Damascus. He found there immense stores of provisions and arms for the troops of the Mamluke Sultans of Egypt. The town continued flourishing even so late as the middle of the seventeenth century. Its central situation between Damascus, Beirut, and Tripolis, must have secured it some profit from the extensive trade carried on through the interior of Syria to the coast of the Mediterranean. The Chevalier d'Arvieux, who visited Ba'albek in 1660, gives an interesting description of it in his memoirs of that time. The city was then large, and defended by walls and towers, which the hand of time and the indolence of the Osmanlis were leaving to decay. The houses were, on the contrary, though ancient, still in excellent condition. It seemed evident to the Chevalier that they had been built with taste and care by a people who had an affection for architecture, and knew how to appreciate its beauties. "We were all comfortably quartered in the khan," says he, "and we visited several houses belonging to our Arab acquaintance, where the arrangement of the apartments, and their distribution, embellishments, and furniture, were all kept up in the ancient Roman style. The inhabitants were Greek Christians. They had an archbishop, and several churches. The greatest number of them were cotton-weavers and dyers, who sent their manufactures to Damascus and Tripolis."

The well-known English pilgrim, Henry Maundrell, passed through Ba'albek in 1697, but appears only to have visited the ruins.

"The city," says he, "enjoys a most delightful and commodious situation on the east side of the valley of Boeot. It is of a square figure, compassed with a tolerably good wall, in

which are towers, all round, at equal distances. It extends about two furlongs on a side. Its houses within are all of the meanest structure, such as are usually seen in Turkish villages."

In the year 1751, Ba'albek had still five thousand inhabitants; but it was nearly destroyed by the tremendous earthquake in 1759, which demolished a great part of the temples. The continual feuds of the Emirs Jusuf and Diezzar brought new misery over the fair plain. The sudden prosperity and rapid conquests of the wild Metawileh terminated with their defeat. Emir-Beshir, and his victorious Druzes, laid Ba'albek in ashes, and forced the Islam heretics to seek refuge in the Anti-Lebanon.

Thus the twelve hundred miserable inhabitants, whom M. de Volney saw in Ba'albek, are now reduced to a few families. During our stay there in 1844, we hardly met with a human being. There were neither bazars nor khans, but heaps of rubbish and ruins everywhere. Even the present Emir Mar-Kandjar has retired with his family and few retainers to the more populous village of Bereitan. According to the barometrical observations of Prof. Russegger, the city lies 3,490 feet above the level of the Mediterranean. Its site at the base of the Anti-Lebanon is picturesque and romantic in the highest degree; its climate is healthful, and its territory well watered by the Litany and other rivulets, extends twelve hours through the upper plain towards the desert of Homs and the termination of the Anti-Lebanon. This more hilly part of the soil is stony and less fertile, but the southern tract towards Zahleh was formerly covered with cornfields and vineyards, which in the latter years have been destroyed during the encampments of the Egyptian troops in these regions.

It had been our intention to ascend Mount Lebanon by the road to Ainaiteh and the ancient cedars; but the Greek bishop, who, besides an elderly woman, was the only denizen of the convent in which we lodged, dissuaded us from undertaking this route, not only because the passage of Jebel-Makmel was still covered with deep snow and no traveler had yet descended to Ba'albek by that road during the spring, but particularly because rumors had spread of a rebellion in that part of the

mountain against the Turkish government. He, therefore, advised us to take the road to Zahleh, where on learning the true state of affairs in the country, we might cross the mountain by the easier pass of Jebel-Sunnin. Another difficulty arose : Mustapha, our dragoman, had never visited this part of Syria : he was therefore ignorant of the road, and we could not get any other guide in Ba'albek. We consequently resolved to pass through the plain to Zahleh. Having spent the whole evening and next morning most delightfully, among the temple-ruins, we took leave of our hospitable bishop and left Ba'albek at eight o'clock. We then crossed the rivulet, which in the plain unites with the Litany, descending from its head-spring at Tell-Hushbein, a hill three miles west of the town. At an hour's ride from the temples we stopped a few moments near a curious octagonal building called Kubbet-Duris, which is evidently a modern fabric, made up with excellent materials from the ruins. It is surrounded by eight columns of a fine red granite ; some have been placed with the upper part down. The architrave formed an octagon, and the cupola had fallen in.

The seven hours' ride through the Baka'a to Zahleh, situated in a narrow deep dell of the Lebanon, is exceedingly pleasant. The morning was bright ; a light breeze swept across the open fields. Not a tree was to be seen, but a rich verdant carpet, checkered by brilliant flowers, covered the whole expanse. In the distance these fresh green tints were changed into a transparent lilac-colored haze, which softly enveloped the two mighty mountain-ridges, while the glittering snow of Jebel-Makmel and Sunnin and the deep clefts of Mount Hermon presented the sharpest and most distinct outline against the azure sky. Here and there herds of cattle and horses were grazing. We passed near the villages of Beit-Shamar and Temnin and arrived at ten o'clock at the ford of the Litany, where in crossing the river the restive mules broke loose from their drivers, and precipitated their burdens in the water. Canteens, trunks and tents, all went down in the greatest confusion, until the horsemen of our party with some difficulty recaptured the frolicking culprits, and collected the drenched luggage. We therefore encamped on the river-side, and in the afternoon con-

tinued our route along the base of Mount Lebanon to Kerak, a ruinous village looking out from a fine grove of cypresses, where Mohammedan tradition places the tomb of Noah. The building consists of two towers connected by a long portico of slender arches, which resembled more an aqueduct than a sepulchre. The Arab traditions from Genesis are numerous in this part of Syria. The abode of Adam, in the plain of Damascus, the altar and sepulchre of Abel, the tombs of Noah and Nimrod, and that of Moses on the mountains of Judah, are all consecrated by cupolas and tomb-stones, where the wandering Muslims dismount and devoutly perform their prayers. It is a curious tradition, that the ark of Noah rested on Jebel-Sunnin, where traces of it are still to be seen !*

We now arrived on the banks of the Barduny, a copious and limpid stream, issuing from a narrow glen in the Lebanon. Zahleh, a large city inhabited by eight or ten thousand Maronite Christians, is situated in a very picturesque and healthy site, on both sides of the river, in that part of the valley where it opens upon the plain of the Buka'a. Immense poplars skirt the banks of the stream, and give quite a northern character to the scenery. Crossing a high stone bridge, we at five o'clock dismounted before the Greek convent, in which several well furnished rooms were most hospitably offered for our accommodation. The view from the terrace of the monastery towards the high frowning rocks of the Jebel-Sunnin, to the deep dell on the north-west, where on a precipice appears another convent, embosomed in a grove of black cypresses and beautiful vineyards, and over the thriving town of Zahleh, eastward to the distant plain and the opposite range of the Anti-Lebanon, is exceedingly interesting. But the troublesome Zahleans did not permit us to enjoy this delightful prospect in quiet. The greater part of them are exiled Christians of the Armenian and Syrian Greek churches, who during the persecutions at Damascus and Halep, have fled with their fam-

* The Greek priests believe that ruins of the ark still exist on the summit of Mount Ararat in Armenia. When my friend Papa Ktenas learned that I was going to the Holy Land, he quite seriously requested me among other reliques to bring him back some splinters from the ark of Noah!

ilies to Mount Lebanon, and thus contributed to the rapid increase of the city. They are very good-humored, and the most lively and industrious inhabitants on the mountain. Many are weavers and tanners, all agriculturists and gardeners, who most sedulously plough the terraces of the hills around and lay them out in vineyards and mulberry groves. We had hardly appeared on the terrace, before the entire population as it seemed, men, women and children, began to lay a regular siege to the convent. Courts and staircases were crowded; from all sides they pressed in upon us, exclaiming in Italian, "Buon giorno, Signori! Siamo Cristiani, anche noi."—"Welcome, gentlemen! we too are Christians." There was no possibility of escaping from the crowd; all the efforts of the monks were in vain, and we were at last obliged to take our pilau and tea in the presence of the wondering multitude. Next morning we were in the saddle at an early hour, and began the ascent of the mountain by a steep path running along the precipices of Jebel-Rihan. The rocks were clothed with a variety of fine shrubs and trees, fir, chestnut, and the blooming oleander. In an hour and a half we reached the height of the pass. Here we met an armed band of Maronites, who told us that a serious insurrection had broken out in the district of Bsherreh. The apparent cause of this rising was an order of the Pasha in Beirut, that the conscription of young men should take place for the regular Turkish army. The consequence was, that the whole valley of Kadisha had taken up arms and driven the Ottoman officers and employees out of the mountain. The Turks of Tripolis were preparing an expedition against Bsherreh, and this general disorder had caused the Maronites and Druzes of the districts of el-Metn and Kesrawan, through which we were now travelling, likewise to arm and observe what turn affairs would take. The confirmation of this news decided us afterwards to change the direction of our route. The prospect from the pass of el-Sunnin is extensive, and more wild and dreary than any I had seen on the Lebanon. We were surrounded by gray, totally barren lime-stone rocks, forming precipices from which numerous streams and rills, foaming and chafing in continual waterfalls, descended in picturesque

variety. At a great distance below, we distinguished the village Biskinta, and beyond it the broad bosom of the sea. From the upper table-land we descended upon a second terrace, where we stopped at a solitary hut. A Maronite shepherd, who was guarding his flock of goats and sheep on a meadow among the patches of snow still covering this part of the ridge, offered us a platter with *lebben* or sour milk, and a wreath of fragrant violets and Alpine roses, which he had gathered from the beautiful bushes of *rhododendron*, growing luxuriantly in these elevated regions. Our horses were extremely fatigued; we left them grazing, and after an hour's rest we descended through dense pine forests by a steep and dangerous pass to the bed of the river Nahr-Salib. Evening was already closing before we gained the opposite heights of el-Mezra'ah. The scenery was sublime; the sun set on the glittering expanse of the distant sea, and suddenly illuminated with hues of the deepest purple the snowy crest of Sunnin, rising majestically above the surrounding pine woods. In a few moments all was darkness again. Our weary horses, panting and snorting, stumbled slowly along the rugged path, and we did not arrive at Mezra'-ah until a late hour in the night. Our muleteers had lost their way, and toiling up and down the hills, they at last found a guide who accompanied them to our quarters. The roads in the mountains of el-Metn and Kesrawan are bad beyond description. I have passed over horrible roads on Mount Etna, near Modica in Sicily, and on Mount Taygetos in Greece, but those of Lebanon are by far the worst of all. "When a traveler penetrates these mountains," says M. de Volney, "the ruggedness of the roads, the steepness of the declivities, the depth of the precipices, have at first a terrific effect; but the sagacity of the mules, which carry him, soon inspires him with confidence, and enables him to examine at his ease, the picturesque scenes, which succeed one another, so as almost to bewilder him. There, as among the Alps, he may travel whole days to arrive at a spot which was in sight when he set out. He turns, he descends, he winds round, he climbs; and under this perpetual change of position, one is ready to think that a magic power is varying at every step the beauties of the land."

scape." The truth of this lively description we fully experienced on our perilous ascent to el-Mezra'ah. The old sheik of the village received us very cordially, and we passed a comfortable night after the fatigues of the day. Mezra'ah consists of some sixty houses, and appeared to be a thriving place. The steep descent towards Ajelun in the valley of Nahr-Salib is terraced and planted with mulberry trees, silk being the principal produce of the Kesrawan. At two hours' distance from Mezra'ah lie the interesting ruins, generally called Kula'at Fakra, or the castle of Fakra, which we visited next morning. These ruins occupy a most singular site on a barren hill, immediately below the frowning heights of Jebel-Sunnin, in a wilderness of rocks, water-falls, and perfect solitude. The walls consist of large square blocks, and are in some parts well preserved. We entered on the east into the interior, and found there the ruins of a temple; three bases of columns are still standing on the platform; a few frusta, parts of an Ionic capital, and interesting fragments of the entablature are lying around. Other ruins, in total desolation, are seen outside the castle, or fortified temple. As to the period to which these temple-ruins belong, and their real name, history is silent. Strabo, the geographer, mentions several castles, such as Sinnan and Borrhama, in this part of the higher regions of the Lebanon: perhaps these castle ruins may have belonged to one of them.

An ascent of twenty-five minutes brought us to the Issr-el-Bughaleh, or Issr-el-Hajr, the famous *natural bridge* of Mount Lebanon. The great distance from the coast, and the fatigue of the rocky roads, must certainly be the cause why this remarkable scenery, the most terrible and romantic of the Lebanon, is so seldom enjoyed by Syrian travelers. Few climb to the snowy regions, except to see the ancient cedars and to cross into the valley of Ba'albek. And yet no landscape of Greece or Italy can in wildness and sublimity be compared with that of the source of the Libnan and its passage beneath Issr-el-Hajr. Immediately below the highest crest of Jebel-Sunnin, the copious river bursts forth from a deep grotto and rushes through a cleft between immense precipices with head-

long speed toward the bridge. A rocky ledge, rising more than two hundred feet above the river, has been perforated by nature, and formed into a huge arch, through which the chafing torrent forces its way among detached rocks hurled down by an earthquake into the chasm below. The bridge is of so regular a formation that one would at the first sight suppose it to be the work of human hands. It offers a far grander spectacle than the celebrated *Ponte di Lupo* near Tivoli in Italy, or the *Teufelsbruecke* in the Alps, and bears a striking resemblance to the natural bridge in Virginia, though the wild and barren mountain scenery of the Lebanon has a sterner and less pleasing character, than the beautiful wood-clad hills of the "Old Dominion." The Issr-el-Hajr is situated 4,926 feet above the level of the Mediterranean, according to the admeasurement of Colonel De Wildenbruch, at that time Prussian Consul-General at Beirut. Dr. H. A. De Forest found the water of the fountain 41° Fahrenheit, while the air at the time was 57°.

Along a very rough path we followed the course of Nahr-Liban, and descended to the woody region of Meiruba. Large pine-forests covered the sides of the mountains; rocks and water-courses were adorned with large masses of *rhododendron*, or laurel rose, which, by its white and violet flowers and rich foliage, distinguished itself from the more common purple oleander in the valleys on the coast. We crossed the deep bed of Nahr-Assil, where all on a sudden three magnificent waterfalls burst on our sight. The cascades came thundering down the steep declivities from the snowy top of Jebel-Sunnin; the spray of the dashing waters rose in a hazy cloud through the wild chasm, and, reflected by the meridian rays of the sun, launched a most glorious rainbow, like an aerial bridge, across the gloomy glen below. A more splendid sight I never saw. Great are the hardships of the traveler who in the early months of the year traverses Mount Lebanon; but he is *amply rewarded* by a freshness of vegetation, a variety of coloring, of light and shade, a picturesque relief of glittering snows and foaming waterfalls, all which he would look for in vain during the later season, when the gray, colorless limestone rocks around, and the cloudless burning sky above, will soon force him to seek a

refuge in the mulberry groves of some village or monastery on the western hills, nearer the coast and enjoying the refreshing breezes from the sea. At an early hour in the afternoon, we arrived at the pretty village of Meiruba, pleasantly situated at the foot of Jebel-Shebrugh, high above the deep and narrow Wady-Salib. We alighted at the house of the Sheik Feris-Chassim, who politely offered us accommodations for the night; but the evening being lovely, we preferred to encamp beneath the mulberry trees, which form a fine grove around the village. At Meiruba we saw the first cedars, which only distinguished themselves from other fir-trees by the remarkable length of their branches ; they were far inferior to the splendid cedars we a few months later saw at Warwick Castle, and on the lakes of Westmoreland, in England. While Mustapha and the muleteers were pitching the tents, we followed the Sheik to his house, on a ledge overlooking the valley, where a most curious scene took place. In all the villages in Syria the houses are stone-built, with flat roofs, and doors so low that the person who enters is obliged to stoop. This custom, said our landlord, had been adopted as a protection against the haughty Turks, who, finding a high door-way, would enter the houses on horse-back, and quarter their steeds in the best part of the dwelling. It happened to be a holy day at Meiruba, and the Maronite Christians, men, women, and children, in their festal dresses, were paying visits or enjoying themselves among the trees. The women, particularly, were distinguished by the *tantur*, a high silver or brazen *horn*, which is attached to the forehead, and covered by a long white veil hanging down at full length behind. We had hardly been seated, and lighted our *nargiles*, before half a dozen *horns* all at once appeared at the low entrance, attempting to enter. They crossed each other, got entangled, and occasioned such a confusion, that it lasted a good while before the first lady could disengage herself and her horn, and enter the room. The whole party then came on, one by one ; but sitting down on the cushions spread out on the floor, they were obliged to pay constant attention to the movements of their neighbors, and bring their own horns in harmony with theirs. This *tantur* is the most inconvenient, silly, and

unbecoming head-gear I ever saw ; but the ladies on the mountain are exceedingly fond of it, and a prohibition to wear it on the part of the husband, they say, would most seriously endanger the harmony of the family. Meiruba is surrounded by the wildest mountain scenery of the Kesrawan ; the ascent to it is by the worst of roads, and yet it became the battle-ground between the Egyptians and Turks during the war in 1840. The old sheik gave me an animated description of those military movements in a region where a mule can hardly find its way along the precipices. The united Anglo-Austro-Ottoman fleet had disembarked an army of twelve thousand troops, with a numerous artillery, in the bay of Juneh, on the main road leading along the coast from Beirut to Tripolis, and northern Syria. A fortified camp had been thrown up, and a communication opened with the mountaineers of the Lebanon, Druzes, and Maronites, when Ibrahim-Pasha, at the head of eight thousand of his best troops from Zahleh, in the plain of the Buka'a, passed the mountain by the pass of Sunnin, and descended along those horrible paths, so well known to us, by Biskinta and Mezra'ah to Meiruba, where he encamped. From thence he sent off different columns across the deep glen of Nahr-el-Salib towards the coast to reconnoitre the Turkish camp, and take position for a general attack. But on those nearly impassable ridges he was suddenly attacked by several Turkish battalions, led on by daring British officers, and at the same time, discovered the armed Druze and Maronite mountaineers from the heights in his rear on all sides descending towards Meiruba. The Egyptian troops, therefore, after a short and ineffectual resistance, were forced to abandon their camp and baggage, and in wild disorder, pursued by the light-footed Druzes, to find their way across the heights of Jebel-Sunnin to the main body of the army encamped in the plain of Ba'albek.

On the 30th of May, we descended to the coasts of the Mediterranean. We had complained of the former roads in the higher regions of the mountain, and yet this last journey proved the most fatiguing. We were obliged to dismount and to lead the horses by the bridle over rocks, where they hardly

found a footing, and every moment seemed in danger of being precipitated into the valley below. From every turn of the path, splendid views of the most varied scenery opened to the interior valleys of the Lebanon. These lower regions were beautifully clothed with wood ; laurel, myrtle, arbutus, thymelea, holm-oak, different species of pines, and other evergreens, formed a thick-set forest, above which here and there arose a venerable cedar spreading its dark branches far away over the precipices. In three hours we reached the last mountain terrace overlooking the deep valley of the river Adonis, the Wady-Nahr-Ibrahim, and the distant coast of Jebail. The heat at noon became oppressive. We therefore stepped at the convent Mar-Deina, the only inhabited place we had seen since we left Meiruba in the morning ; and, pitching our tents beneath the beautiful trees on the very edge of the rocks above the valley of Adonis, we awaited the breeze in the afternoon springing up from the sea. These woody highlands were in mythology the favorite haunts of Adonis, the hunter, the Phoenician personification of the Sun-god, and lover of Astarte, who was killed by the wild boar, and by the sorrowing goddess transformed into a rose. The Greeks afterwards took up this pretty Syrian fable, representing the return of the sun after the autumnal equinox, and the withering approach of winter, and instituted the worship of Adonis at the splendid temple at Byblos.

The prospect over the sea from the height of Deir-Mar-Deina is fine, and it increases in beauty as the traveler descends towards the bridge crossing the Adonis, at the base of the mountain. The interior of Lebanon we had found a solitude ; here at once we met with life and movement. On the banks of the river, thickly covered with the fragrant white and blue agnus-castus and purple oleander—the glorious *tri-color* of all the valleys of Syria—stood a camp of Turkish cavalry. The Arab horsemen were galloping along the sands, throwing their lances, and wheeling about their rapid and beautiful chargers, in the presence of some grave-looking Turkish officers in European uniforms, smoking their chiboukis before the khan on the bridge of Nahr-Ibrahim. What a picture for an artist ! The

'variegated moving groups on the yellow sands, the sea-green tents with their red streaming bandrols, the high vaulted bridge over the deep glassy river, the wood-clad mountains, and the glittering sea, all illuminated by the soft and mellow hues of a Syrian sky ! And yet interesting as is the scenery of Mount Lebanon, we felt extremely happy here on the sandy shore with the foaming surge and the broad horizon of the Mediterranean before us, after our toilsome and perilous scrambling among the rocks ; nay, even our horses seemed to partake of our delight, and carried us at full speed along the rocky coast towards the ancient towers of Jebail, which invited us from afar. In an hour and a half we reached the gate, and, saluting the grim-looking Albanian warriors, who formed the garrison, with their own usual greeting, "*Besa gia besa,*" (truce be between us,) we passed them unmolested, and dismounted at the Armenian convent. This establishment was inhabited by five or six monks, and looked as gloomy and uncomfortable as the city of Adonis itself. Jebail is surrounded by walls and towers, which seem to have been built during the crusades with ancient materials. The castle has a strong situation on the south of the city, near the coast, and forms a massive square, built up with enormous blocks. All the lower courses are evidently the work of antiquity ; but the upper part is Saracenic, and the whole was in a totally dilapidated condition. In the interior is a Gothic Christian church, now used as a barracks for the Arnaut garrison. A fine orange grove extends from the castle towards the shore, where the British marines suffered a severe repulse in 1840. A squadron having anchored off the coast, began to batter the fortress ; and, meeting with no resistance, a body of marines landed, and marched through the orange garden straight towards the castle, which they supposed evacuated by the enemy. Yet close to the walls, they were suddenly received with a well sustained fire from the long Albanian *toufekis*, which sent death and destruction into their ranks. The proud red-coats, who had neglected to reconnoitre the environs, now at once perceived the impossibility of scaling those high and strong walls beneath a galling fire from invisible foes. They attempted in vain to rally, and bring up some field-pieces.

The stout Albanians continued their terrible fire, and soon forced the British with a heavy loss to make a speedy retreat to their boats.

Jebail is the ancient Byblos, which, according to Strabo, lay on a hill at some distance from the sea. Its inhabitants were good mechanics; they particularly excelled in the art of working in wood, and are said to have been employed by the Tyrians, and even by the Jews in the building of the great temple at Jerusalem.

The present town is the seat of poverty and misery. The harbor is destroyed and covered with ruins; commerce has fled; the bazaars are shut up and abandoned, and the khans and public places are filled with marauding Albanian soldiery. The few inhabitants mostly live in the fields; they are Maronite Christians, and cultivate that famous *black tobacco* so well known in the Levant by the name of *Jebail*. It is aromatic, of an exceedingly pleasant flavor, and inferior only to that of Latakia, (Laodicea,) a city situated north of Tripolis.

The unsettled state of the northern parts of Syria, the sedition in the valley of Kadisha, and the military movements along the coast, caused us at present to renounce our visit to the cedars, and next morning, May the 31st, to return to Beirut.

We left Jebail at seven o'clock, and after a pleasant ride of three hours along the coast, we passed the promontory of Klimax, and arrived in the fine bay of Juneh. Further south, a long blue ridge, studded with white specks, the houses of the distant city of Beirut, reminded us of the limit of our Syrian travels. Juneh consists only of a row of magazines and store-houses for the export of the silks and productions of Zuk-Mekavil, the thriving little capital of the Kesrawan, which has a most romantic and beautiful situation on the hills, overlooking the valley of Anturah and the sea. We here left the coast and ascended to Zuk through a grove of high Italian pines. Its Maronite inhabitants pressed around us, and offered us hospitality with an earnestness not often to be met with in this country; the greatest part of them are silk-weavers, saddlers, and shoemakers. Almost every house has a loom. The peo-

ple here are industrious, intelligent, and in consequence, better dressed and lodged than in other parts of the mountain. The whole region is thickly planted with mulberry trees. The silkworms are kept in separate houses, or bowers, made of branches, and are attended with particular care. Charming as are the views from the hill of Zuk-Mekavil, those from the nunnery of Deir-Sidi-el-Bsherra are still far superior. A road lined with hedges of prickly pear, and here and there adorned with clusters of majestic pines, leads to the convent lying on a high hill commanding an extensive horizon over sea and land. Deir-el-Bsherra contained at the time of our visit twenty-five nuns. It is a large, solid, square building of hewn freestone, with many small windows carefully closed by Turkish verandas, and surrounded by gardens, well watered, and filled with fig, lemon, orange, and pomegranate trees. On our arrival, a Maronite clergyman politely bade us welcome, and conducted us to a small neat house on the southern terrace of the convent, where the guests, the *mousafirides*, are lodged. Coffee and pipes were brought, and in the afternoon a savory dinner was served. It consisted of several dishes, the usual pilau, *kepamas*, or lamb with tomatoes and onions, boiled fish, fruits, sweetmeats, and some bottles of delicious *vino d'oro* from the Lebanon.

We obtained permission to visit the church and the convent garden, but did not see any of the Maronite nuns, though we inferred that they were willing to get a look at the fair-haired Anglo-Saxons, as we heard them talking and tittering from behind their wooden *kafasi*, or Turkish blinds. They are said to be well treated and happy. At certain hours of the day they work in the garden and tend their silkworms.

The environs of the convent are terraced, and form one continual mulberry grove. Silk appears to be its principal wealth. The upper terrace commands a magnificent panorama; numerous monasteries and villages are seen crowning the prominent ridges, all separated by deep and narrow ravines, or by sloping fertile valleys. Groups of dark cypresses and pines, relieved by pale olive woods, give quite an Italian character to the landscape. Northeastward, on an elevated brow, stands the large

Maronite convent Bkirky, where the patriarch resides during winter; still higher, on a steep conical hill rises Harispa, with towers and battlements, the Franciscan monastery. At an hour's distance in the charming valley below, lies the well-known college of Anturah, and beyond it Deir-Mar-Elias, many other cloistets, and above them the soaring snow-capped masses of Jebel-Kuneiyiseh, one of the loftiest summits of Lebanon. Beirut itself is not seen; it lies hid by the promontory of the Dog river, Ras-Nahr-el-Kelb; but the dark expanse of the sea, with the fine deep bay of Juneh, complete this panorama, which hardly has its equal even in Syria.

Next morning we sent off our muleteers with the tents and baggage directly for Beirut, while we paid a visit to the French in Anturah. The college was originally established by the Jesuits, and on the dissolution of that order in 1764, it was transferred to their successors, the Lazarists, like all other establishments and possessions belonging to that order in Greece and the Levant. There were four professors, several Arab teachers, and fifty-eight students, all very comfortably lodged in the convent. The house is airy, and built in the style of architecture of Southern France. The rooms are furnished in the European manner; library, bed-rooms and refectory are remarkably clean and well kept, and every attention paid to the health and comfort of the students. Several European travelers, studying the Arabic, take their board and lodging in the convent. Among the French missionaries, who in this college prepared for their vocation, were two young Lazarists, with whom I had made the passage from Smyrna to Beirut the winter before. In the latter city the order possesses another convent.

Anturah has been well chosen for a seat of study on account of the seclusion, the salubrity of the climate, and the beauty of its environs. From the terrace of the college, which is shaded with magnificent orange trees, lofty as chestnuts in other countries, and covered with thousands of their golden fruit, we, for the last time, viewed this wonderfully charming scenery of Syria. We here heard of the arrival at Beirut of the Austrian steamer, which, in a day or two, was to take us back to

Europe. This obliged us to decline the invitation of the professors to dine with them at college, and after a short visit we mounted our horses for the last ride. Our road lay through groves of pine and chestnut, and extensive vineyards ascending to the pretty villages and convents which everywhere, here in the Kesrawan, crown the tops of the hills. We left on our right Zuk-Mekavil and Musbah, towards the mountain Deir-Tannis, and descended from the plateau by a most dangerous zigzag path to the deep and shady valley of the Dog river, Nahr-el-Kelb. Several melancholy accidents had happened here. A few years ago the Pope's legate to the Maronites was precipitated, by a stumble of his horse, into the deep glen below, where he perished. We prudently dismounted and conducted the trembling animals over the most dangerous places. All went on well; we reached the banks of the glassy and voiceless Nahr-el-Kelb, whose head-spring we had seen some days before among the foaming water-falls of Wady-Salib on the bleak table-land of Jebel-Shebruh. What a wonderful change of scenery, climate and vegetation does the traveler meet with in Syria! The Dog river flows in a deeply contracted gorge of high perpendicular rocks, leaving only a narrow margin on its right bank covered with trees and rushes. On our sudden appearance in the ravine, some horses, which were grazing on the river side, took fright and galloped on before us, and although we attempted to get up with them and bring them back, the narrowness of the path did not permit it, and they continued their headlong career to the opening of the valley, at the embouchure of the river, to the great despair of the little Arab horse-boy trudging along in the rear.

In an hour we arrived at the termination of the gorge. The southern ridge here sinks abruptly down to the sea, and forms the famous pass of Ras-Nahr-el-Kelb. The river is crossed by a stone bridge of six arches, a fabric of the celebrated Druze prince, Fakr-ed-din, who, by the treachery of the Turks, was taken prisoner in Beirut, brought to Constantinople, and beheaded in 1631. As the promontory allows of no passage between it and the sea, an artificial road, two yards in breadth, has with infinite labor been cut along the rocks at a height of

eighty feet above the level of the water. The clefts of the precipice have in several places been filled up by masonry of great strength, forming a parapet for the security of the passengers. An inscription in large letters engraved at an elevation on the side of the rocky wall, inform us, that Antoninus Pius ordered this road along the impending mountains—*montibus imminentibus*—to be opened on the banks of the Lycus. This interesting monument of the benevolent Emperor is as perfectly preserved as a similar Roman inscription on the rocks of Mount Ossa, in the celebrated valley of Tempe in Thessaly, and can be distinctly read from the Via Antoniniana below. The mouth of the Lycus is shallow and obstructed by rocks precipitated from the promontory above. The caravans, therefore, generally descend and ford the river, instead of following the more circuitous passage of the bridge. On the road side near the bridge stands an ancient pedestal, which the Arabs believe to have supported the statue of a *dog*, and at a short distance from the shore they point out a huge black rock, rising from the sea, as being the idol in question, which gave name to the river. Thus the ancient appellations in all this tract of the coast, from Byblos and the Adonis river southward to Berytos and Sidon, the Caleb or Kelb (dog) of the Hebrews, the Lycos (wolf) of the Greeks and Romans, and Sidon (Zidon, the hunter,) of the Canaanites, seem all to refer to the *astronomical legends* of the hunting and death of Adonis, whom Venus is fabled to have loved and lamented.

In remote times, before Antoninus Pius opened this lower and more convenient passage, a steeper and more difficult path led higher up in sharp turns across the cape. Here are found those curious rock sculptures, which have excited so great an interest among the modern antiquarians. On the rocky wall overhanging the ancient pathway at different distances on the ascent, we admired six or seven large tablets with curious figures, sculptured in the gray limestone rock. Dismounting and ordering the dragoman to lead our horses down to the beach on the south side of the promontory, we climbed up to these relics of antiquity. They differ in character and preservation. Some have been so much corroded by exposure to the atmos-

sphere and the hand of time on the rough surface of the limestone, that their figures and inscriptions have become nearly obliterated. Yet the two larger tablets standing close together on the highest point of the passage are wonderfully well preserved. The northern monument presents a highly ornamented Egyptian door-way surmounted by the winged globe, symbolical of the spiritual fire that moves and actuates the universe, according to Egyptian philosophy. Within the door is seen a hero in the Egyptian costume holding a bow in his right hand and brandishing a battle-axe in his left. The figure is fiercely striding forward, and in the act of immolating a kneeling prisoner in the presence of a high-capped Egyptian deity. These sculptures have a decided resemblance to those of the great procession on the walls of the Ramsessium at Thebes, in Upper Egypt ; and what is still more important, the hieroglyphic mouldings on the door-way contain likewise the well-known characters of Ramses the Second, the great Sesostris of the Greeks, that formidable conqueror of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, who during nearly half a century (1560—1490, B. C.) spread the terror of his name from the deserts of Nubia to the shores of the Pontus Euxinus. This discovery, made some years ago by the artist Bonomi, is highly interesting ; and it may now be regarded as a historical fact, that the great Ramses, on his march northward through Syria caused this monument of his deeds to be sculptured on the mountain at the mouth of the Lycus, where he is supposed to have embarked in his fleet and crossed over to the island of Kittim or Cyprus. All this coincides with the relation of Herodotus, who mentions that he saw rock-sculptures in Ionia and Palestine, commemorating the expeditions of the warlike king ; and we may thus with confidence assert, that the eloquent father of history, twenty-three centuries ago, had been standing on this mountain road between the cliffs and the sea, and with admiration had inspected, as we do now, this identical but then more perfect monument. This may likewise be said of another curious tablet on the south, close to that just mentioned. It has quite a different character from the Egyptian, and may no doubt be of Assyrian origin. Within an arched door-way stands the

figure of a man finely carved in low-relief, the upper part of which is perfectly well preserved, while the lower is covered with a much defaced inscription in arrow-headed characters. He is dressed in the long flowing garments of the Medes or Assyrians, and his high pontifical tiara has a striking resemblance to the modern Persian *kalpak* of black sheepskin. He wears a curious long square beard; the left hand rests on his bosom, the right is lifted on high, pointing at a crescent and globe, and some other figures, symbolical of the time, which are sculptured in the left quarter of the tablet. This priest or hero is supposed to represent one of the three Assyrian conquerors, either Phul, Tiglat-Pilesar, or Salmanassar, who during the period from 770 to 720, B. C., overran Syria and Palestine with their numerous armies, and who might have been ambitious enough to wish to record their victories on the same rock on which they found the memorial of the still more celebrated Sesostris. How many conquering armies have toiled up through this narrow defile since the remote centuries when the Egyptian and Assyrian sculptures were engraved on this rock! Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Saracens, Crusaders, Turks, and Ibrahim-Pasha, the would-be Sesostris of modern times, have all had their turn. The last hero scrambling down to the Dog river appears to have been Sir Charles Napier in his straw hat and shirt sleeves, leading on his marines and blue-jackets.

And now we turned round towards the sea, which, smooth and bright like a mirror, studded here and there by a white sail, lay spread out at our feet. On the south, we surveyed the fine bay of St. George, and the far-stretching promontory of Ras-el-Beirut, the picturesque city on its slope, with its mosques, towers, and white country houses, looking out from the mulberry groves and orange gardens, and the numerous shipping on the roadstead, a sight so uncommon on the desert shores of Syria. From the pass below rose the sound of the tinkling bells of the camels and the whooping of their drivers as they passed along, and then on a sudden gleamed the lances of a body of Bedouin horsemen, slowly ascending the defile from Beirut, and crossing the bridge of Nahr-el-Kelb on their march for Tripolis.

But the time for departure had arrived. We descended to the plain, mounted our horses, and after a pleasant gallop on the wet sands, we, at one o'clock in the afternoon, arrived at Beirut, where with a liberal *bakchis*, we dismissed our attentive dragoman Mustapha, and the muleteers, and then joined a large assembly of British and American travelers just returning from Jerusalem, with whom we were to start next day for Smyrna and Europe.

On the 3d of June, at sunset, we were all embarked on board the fine steamer *l'Imparatrice*, belonging to the company of the Austrian Lloyds. Thus, then, after an absence of more than eleven years, which I had spent so pleasantly with studies and travels in the South and the East, I was now going to revisit my native land in the far North, and perhaps, crossing the Atlantic, to carry to the flourishing States of the new world some few of those bright pictures and dear recollections of men and their doings, which I had so laboriously collected in the old.

The landing place of Beirut, in the mean time, had filled with spectators, and numerous boats were tossing around the steamer. At last, Captain Brunette gave the signal for departure. The Reverend gentlemen of the American mission, Consul Laurella, and Colonel Rose, then took leave of their departing friends and returned to the shore. The anchors were heaved, and we stood out of the bay. The smiling coast receded more and more; soon night sank on the waters; and when the morning dawn again called us on deck, fair Syria had disappeared, and the distant island of Cyprus began to rise on the western horizon.

Lancaster, Pa.

A. L. K.

ART. III.—FAITH AND REASON.

A SERMON BY DR. RAUCH.

A number of sermons by the lamented Rauch, the first President of Marshall College, having lately come into our hands, we have concluded to publish one or two of them, as a specimen both of his labors in the pulpit and of his method of thinking in its direct application to Christianity. To his surviving pupils, to the later students of the College who have learned to revere his name, as well as to the literary community in general, that are familiar with his profound work on Psychology, we doubt not this will be an acceptable service. For as a minister of the Gospel, though not popular in the prevailing sense of the word, he was, nevertheless, as faithful, instructive and efficient, as he was thorough, interesting and successful in the Lecture Room. A clear conception of the divine-human person of Jesus Christ in His vital relation to all the parts of the Christian system, gave its distinctive tone to his sermons. All were well adapted to the peculiar and varied wants of College students. Many, however, were properly philosophico-theological dissertations; for his habit of philosophical thinking, harmonizing essentially with the spirit and form of divine revelation, always determined his manner of expounding a passage of Scripture or of discussing a subject. Such at least can consistently have a place in our Quarterly, although it is not designed as a medium for the publication of sermons.

We have selected the one which follows, on Faith and Reason, because it discusses a principle which subsequently became the fundamental idea of the Mercersburg Review and is contained in the language of Anselem: "Neque enim quaero intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam." It is interesting to see how the first President, under the influence of whose powerful mind Marshall College came into existence, labored to

cast its inmost life in a mold, at once really philosophical and distinctively Christian—a mold that enlarged and modified by his successors, has left its impress upon the history of the Institution and the progress of the German Reformed Church.

This sermon bears no date, but, if we remember correctly, it was preached in the chapel at Mercersburg, during the early part of 1838 ; and was occasioned by some sceptical tendencies which became apparent among a few of the students. It was of course not intended nor written for the public eye, yet we have seen fit to submit it without any alterations or modifications. We have merely given it a touch of the pen, here and there, in order to remove some traces of the German idiom; whilst every phase of thought and all the peculiarities of his style have been scrupulously preserved, evidences of which can be seen in almost every line.

It was the habit of Doctor Rauch to write out the first or principal prayer carefully, as well as the sermon. As this will aid in affording the reader an insight into the spirit and character of the man, we give it its proper place.—EDS.

PRAYER.

Lord, our Heavenly Father, Thou art Light and Holiness, but we are sinners. Whatever is good and noble proceeds from Thee, and has its origin in Thee ; but whatever is evil and sinful, takes its rise in our hearts and flows forth from them into our thoughts and words and actions. Thou givest what is good and perfect ; we abuse it and make it a source of evil. All thy laws, Lord ! are good and perfect ; thy institutions and commandments are good and tend to the welfare of all created beings ; but we, Lord ! dishonor them, disobey them, violate them, and thus change the intended source of bliss into a fountain of misery. This, Lord ! is our guilt, that we abuse Thy gracious goodness, and do not acknowledge Thee as the Author and Ruler of the universe and do not love Thee as our Benefactor and Preserver.

Lord ! we pray that Thou wilt make us sensible of this our great guilt ; that Thou wilt open our blind eyes and shed the Light of Thy Spirit upon them, that we may be able to see Thee and Thy perfections, to adore and worship Thee and to

honor Thee by devoting every power, every wish and every thought to Thy service. O that we were enabled, Lord ! all of us, to see that the sin of all sin, the root and seat of all vices and all evil activities, is our *infidelity* ; that we can not be good and virtuous without faith.

May we acknowledge this, O Lord! with becoming humility, and lay aside all pride, all reliance on our own strength, and all hope in our own righteousness. May we come before Thee with humbleness and meekness and say : Here, Lord ! we are ready to receive the operations of Thy Holy Spirit. May we lay aside the weapons of an unregenerated reason, of wit and acuteness and cease fighting against our Maker ; with a contrite heart may we desire and long for Him who loved us unto death ; and may we consider it our highest blessing while we live, and our highest consolation in the hour of death, that we were privileged to praise the Lord and serve Him.

We pray, Lord, that Thou wilt be with us as we are assembled here to day. Strengthen those among us that believe in Thee, and increase their knowledge and love ; be with those that are still out of Christ ; show them their perilous situation and constrain them, by seeing it, to hasten to the cross. May they feel, Lord, that without faith none is acceptable to Thee. May they admit in their hearts that the length of time allotted to them is unknown to them and to all of us, but that there is nothing more certain than death, and after death, the judgment. May they flee from thy wrath and accept the offers of mercy, whilst they have it in their power.

Bless all thy people, wherever they worship Thee to-day.*

SERMON.

Text: Acts 17:18. "Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoicks, encountered him. And some said, What will this babbler say ? Other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods : because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection."

Unbelief in its general results, is every where the same; but it may spring from essentially different fountains and from

* The conclusion of the Prayer was evidently not written. We give it as we find it in the manuscript.—Eds.

them draw a nourishment which makes it more or less dangerous to those within the reach of its influence. When a rude and uncultivated man, belonging to a low state of cultivation although living in a civilized country, laughs at the emotions of a pious and devoted Christian ; when he acknowledges nothing but what is accessible to his unrefined sensibility—we neither feel offended nor do we see any dangers arising from his influence. His senses are obtuse, his thinking power unexercised, his whole disposition bent to the earth on which he lives ; hence his unbelief, basing itself upon a degradation of human nature, rather *disgusts* than *alarms* us.

Again, if a sensual and voluptuous man, who has made pleasure the object of his life, denies the existence of God, and scorns the idea of a Saviour and of the immortality of the soul, we know that the cause of his infidelity is a wish to be unmolested by the voice of conscience, when he is about to deceive innocence or break a promise or empty the cup of sensuality or serve all the contemptible desires of his depraved heart. When such men avow their infidelity we feel disgusted; our moral sense stamps them with contempt; our judgment perceives a poisonous fruit that has grown on the tree of sin and vice. Against such infidelity we need not warn men—it is not attractive but repulsive.

It is far otherwise, when men whom Providence has gifted with many talents, whom constant application has adorned with knowledge and whom faithfulness has rendered useful as citizens and eminent in their profession ; when men who lead an honest and blameless life, who do not scoff at religion, nor look down with an eye of pity on its adherents; when such men do not embrace Christ by faith, but caught by the net of infidelity, tear asunder the ties which bind them to their Saviour ! when, though they do not doubt a Providence, a First Cause of all, nor an eternity, they are, nevertheless, strangers to the altar and visit the assemblies of Christians only as critics, but not from a desire for religious instruction. The respect which their wisdom and moral life secure to them, forbids us to disregard their indifference to religion; for it misleads the unwary, ensnares the unsuspecting and arrests the attempts of youth to

enter the narrow path, which leads through thorns and briars to Heaven. This is the unbelief of which the text speaks.

At first sight, it might appear that the unbelief of the Epicureans was that of levity; for we are accustomed to look upon them as mere sensualists. History, however, proves, that their philosophical system tended not only to, but terminated in, that of the Stoics, whose names are associated in our memory with great and grave wisdom. The principle of Epicureanism was a *refined* and *prudent self-love*, which prompted the endeavor to reduce *pains* and *wants* to the smallest, and increase *pleasures* to the highest degree; to select of all pleasures those that were both most refined and most durable, and always to preserve an unclouded serenity. This latter point led to Stoicism; for in order to be cheerful constantly, we must feel entirely independent of all things around us, neither *fear* nor *hope* too ardently, but always be ready to resign every wish and every possession. A wise man, in their opinion, was one, who, free from every fear and hope, free from the dominion of every passion, was ever conscious of his moral greatness and felt the highest gratification in viewing his own virtues. In these the happiness of man was placed. Thus, every one was or sought to be the author of his own fortune during life. The unbelief of the Epicureans and Stoics can, therefore, not be classed with that proceeding from levity, nor with that whose source is an obtuse mind; it took its origin in too high an estimate placed by them upon their wisdom or upon their reason.

This undue estimation is even in our day a prolific source of indifference to religion; I have, therefore, made it the subject of my present discourse. My design is to show that, though reason and faith are not at war with each other and though reason is a high gift of man, yet it is not the proper criterion to be applied in judging of Christianity, nor can its attacks upon Christianity ever destroy it.

I.

In attempting to show this, I neither desire to lower the value of reason, as if religion can gain in proportion as reason loses, nor to attribute to faith what really does not belong to it. In

comparing one with the other, I am ready at once to admit, that reason is the highest gift we possess in a state of nature. It is reason, which makes man the lord of the earth and renders him the most wonderful of all creatures. It is reason, that puts the bridle into the mouth of the horse to subdue him, that spreads the net in the air to catch the swift-flying bird, and throws the angle into the water to entice its inhabitants. It is reason, that leads off the lightning from our houses, that makes the ocean yield its tribute, that governs the elements and renders what in itself is destructive and awful, useful to man. It is reason, that measures the distances and dimensions of the stars of heaven, that foretells the regular return of the seasons, and, sinking itself into its own unfathomable depth, constructs systems of science, discovers the secret powers of nature, and with the wings of a Daedalus finds its way out of every labyrinth to the centre of light.

But every thing human has its two sides. The same reason, which is so wonderful in itself and does such wonderful things, in a state of nature, labors only for our own interests, for the gratification of our depraved desires and passions. It has not only invented the instruments with which we cultivate the field, but also the machinery with which we torture and destroy our fellow-men. Reason not only remembers the injury done us and meditates on revenge, but even hates those whom we have offended, calumniates our brother, and converts truth into falsehood whenever our advantage may seem to require it. He is frequently thought to be the wisest, who knows best how to use the failings of others for his own benefit, who is most cunning and crafty in the abuse of confidence placed in him, and of candor and honesty observed towards him. *Deceptions, quarrels, murders, wars,* are carried on systematically only by the human race and no where else in nature; for to design evil, reason is requisite.

Reason, then, as all must admit, places man indeed at the summit of a fallen creation, but it cannot raise him beyond it; a member of the whole, he is at the same time the fountain head of depravity. But what reason cannot do, faith effects; it gives man an entrance into heaven.

What is Faith? This is the most natural question here. Yet it is extremely difficult to answer it. He who has it, will but rarely inquire into its nature; and he who has it not, can not understand it. Who would undertake to describe color to one born blind, or sound to the deaf and dumb? Light is only where there is an eye to see it, and sound, where there is an ear to hear it: take away the eye and the ear, and light and sound cease to be for us. So it is with faith. No one can understand it, unless he has that in him, which disposes him to perceive it, or, in other words: no one can know what faith is unless he has turned from sin to holiness—from the visible to the invisible—from this earthly abode to our heavenly home. Without repentance there is no faith. Nor can any one, on the other hand, understand what repentance is without faith. Both condition each other, and depend on each other: both proceed from communion with God, our Creator—both are directed and direct man upon his Father in Heaven. Without faith no one can repent; without repentance no one can believe. He that does not believe in his eternal home, will not turn towards it; he that never turns his mind towards it, will not believe in it. As faith reveals the kingdom of Christ to the understanding and heart, so does repentance open the heart to faith. If we believe without repentance, we deceive ourselves; if we repent without faith, we torture ourselves. The one is contained in the other. The question: What is Faith? is difficult to be answered, therefore, not because we can not give a definition of it, but because the best definition will not give him an idea of faith who does not possess it. If I say: Faith is that power, whose equal cannot be found any where, the power that gives sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, life to the dead, it will require faith to believe in it. If I say: It is the power of God that in the twinkling of an eye heals the sick, gives peace to the troubled and comfort to the afflicted, again faith will be required to believe in it. This power exists and works, but those that do not believe in it, have not the ability to perceive it: so is every spring adorned with beautiful flowers, yet a blind man does not see them: so do the most lovely sounds float around the ears of a deaf man, yet he does not

hear them. As long as man is satisfied with the vain things of the earth, as long as his wishes do not extend beyond what is visible, he cannot understand the nature of faith. He may ask after it, he may even enter upon subtle speculations concerning it, but the gates of heaven, though open to the eye of faith, will remain closed to his dull and sensual sight. He lives in the dust, from which he is taken and to which he must return ; and what his senses cannot perceive has no existence for him. But to the Christian, faith is that power which connects heaven and earth, the Creator and the creation ; to him, it is a messenger from God to the soul, a bringer of eternal life, a torch in the darkness of his earthly pilgrimage, a guide to heaven. This power we have, when we feel the connection between heaven and earth, between our Creator and ourselves, the visible and invisible ; when whatever we desire or undertake, think or do, proceeds spontaneously from the idea of this connection ; this power we have, when deeply feeling our depravity, we long after purity and holiness, and after the way that leads to both.

II.

Having seen that faith and reason differ, let us inquire, in the second place : *Are they necessarily opposed to each other ?*

The opinion of some is that reason is the enemy of faith, and philosophy that of theology. This opinion, if carried out consistently, would lead to the conclusion that faith is *blind*—that in order to believe we must suspend our thinking powers. Faith without thought is superstition ; thinking without faith produces infidelity ; in both cases, therefore, when faith excludes reason or when reason excludes faith, there is sin and vice. Faith does not exclude reason, but is full of reason, and as all Christians maintain, is based on the best of reasons. Christians do not resign the use of their reason ; they think as well as the unbeliever, who prides himself on his own thought and wisdom ; but Christians think *otherwise*. Faith and reason do, therefore, not oppose but include each other ; and only when our depraved desires apply the one where the other ought to prevail, do they come into conflict. Each of them has its appropriate sphere ; and each sphere it will be well to point out in a few words.

Man enjoys many faculties, but each only, when applied to its appropriate object, between which and itself there is a pre-determined correspondence, and by which alone its activity can be elicited. So each of our senses has its appropriate object, the eye light, the ear sound ; but if we should ever desire to see with the ear or to hear with the eye, we would deprive ourselves of the knowledge which can alone be obtained by making use of the proper sense. So it is likewise, if we attempt to reason where we should believe ; we then lose the object of faith, and faith itself. Reason has its appropriate sphere of action. This sphere is life and its concerns, science and its development. God gave man reason that he might investigate the powers of nature and use them for his service. Without faith, however, reason can effect but little ; for whatever lies beyond *external nature*, falls within the sphere of faith. We see, for example, the seed cast into the earth put forth its roots, its stem, its branches, leaves and blossoms; but the power that works in it, the law, according to which the species preserves itself in its individual plant, we cannot see. From its phenomena we conclude upon the power itself, though our senses cannot perceive it, nor reason demonstrate it. Here, then, begins the sphere of faith—not of the faith of the Christian but of common faith. Where we cannot see things with our eyes, nor ascertain them with our reason, but are nevertheless forced to admit their existence, there we believe. The sphere of natural reason is the Visible, that of faith the Invisible ; without some kind of faith, even the most violent infidel cannot live ; without it he could not eat nor drink, nor have a friend ; or, as some one has said, without it man is confined to himself and stands alone, without father, mother or friend. And there is no more certainty in the objects of reason, than in those of faith. As the eye demands the light, so the world within demands the existence of the Invisible. What our eyes see we believe, and the ground of belief is found in the formation of the eye and its adaptation to things visible. What faith sees we must believe, and the ground of our belief is the constitution of the soul. The shining light needs nothing else to make itself manifest, because the eye stands in need of it

and desires it. The soul is so constituted that it stands in need of a spiritual world ; but when we need a thing, when we cannot do without it, when without it we cannot reach our purposes, nor preserve, develop and perfect ourselves, we are ready to believe in it. As our lungs demand the air, and our bodies food, so our souls demand an invisible world of spirit. There are wants which man has created by his own art ; these are not necessary to his existence. There are others, which may be satisfied without faith ; we may nourish our bodies, gratify our senses, quench our thirst for rank, for riches and influence without faith ;—but the wants of the soul, its irresistible desire for eternal happiness, for truth, for holiness, demand a home beyond the stars, and to admit these wants and desires is to believe in that home. What we desire we are inclined to believe ; and what it is impossible for us to do without, we cannot help admitting. And who is there, that would not acknowledge, that though he eats and drinks according to the desire of his heart, he is, nevertheless, not satisfied ; that he constantly seeks something in riches or learning without finding what he seeks ; that he labors but effects nothing ; that he gathers but gains nothing ; that he is surrounded by abundance but feels poor. It is faith alone that can satisfy these internal demands of the soul ; hence it is, that we are constrained to believe in the objects of faith, and that faith has as much certainty for us as the conviction produced by experience.

Why then do we believe in God ? Though the faith of the Christian differs widely from the faith just exhibited, the question : Why do we believe in God or in Christ ? must be answered on a similar ground. We believe, because the Spirit of truth has operated upon us and constrained us to acknowledge a Creator of the universe and a Ruler over our lives. There would be a chasm, a flaw, in our thoughts without this belief. We believe in Him, because we acknowledge with a grateful heart the many blessings he has bestowed upon us, the many benefits he has poured out upon the whole creation; because the wonderful order and beauty of the world awake our hearts to love Him, and because thousands and thousands of ties bind us to Him, whose image we are and in whom we live and move and have our being.

And so we believe in Christ, because He offers our hearts what they need ; because by His justice and sufferings He has secured to us reconciliation with God ; because He has given us the peace we had not and the salvation, which we sought for in vain ; because in Him true light, life, grace and truth appear ; because we know His voice and understand it ; because we know that he is the good Shepherd, that knows His own and is known of them, for whom He laid down His life that they might live through Him. We believe in Him and love Him, because His truth refreshes, comforts, cheers and consoles us ; for it teaches us that there is a God, a Creator, a Preserver and Ruler, and an eternal Judge of the world and an eternal home of happiness and bliss.

We have seen, then, that reason and faith are not opposed to each other, but that each has its appropriate sphere and that they oppose each other only when a corrupt heart undertakes to model them according to its desires. Let it be remembered,

III.

That reason should not presume to sit in judgment on matters of faith.

Faith, as has been shown, possesses an internal evidence, which exists only for him who has faith. We cannot prove any thing, unless we have its spirit ; we cannot judge of a thing unless we have a measure by which to value it ; and how should reason, unacquainted with this internal evidence, with the only way of proving faith, be able to judge of it ? To call this internal evidence our own, we must have *experienced* it, and before we have done so, we have *no right* to reason on it. Every *right* presupposes the fulfilment of a *duty*, and none can morally enjoy the former without performing the latter. I have a right to live only, if I perform the duty of preserving the life and health of my body and respecting the rights of my fellow-men. He who claims the right of judging of faith, must have performed the duty of having made himself acquainted with its spirit, its nature and objects, else he will be like the blind man who judges of color, or like the deaf man who speaks of the sounds of music. Whenever reason presumes to

judge without having experienced faith, it universally leads to doubting. For it is the nature of reason to doubt what it cannot understand and to ridicule it.

But neither scepticism nor ridicule were ever able to injure the Christian religion. Scepticism cannot injure it, because it is too weak in itself, and religion too strong. The sceptic says : " *We can know nothing* ;" but in saying so he contradicts himself; for if it is certain that *we can know nothing*, we must know this at least to be a fact, and consequently we know something. And this very knowledge is saving knowledge ; it is the beginning of all wisdom. The sceptic says : " *We cannot attain any truth* ;" but this that we cannot attain any truth, he admits to be truth and consequently contradicts himself. If he would listen to this contradiction, if he would apply his rule, to doubt every thing concerning religion, to his own doubts also, he would soon free himself from this vulture that preys on his vitals. The truly consistent sceptic, who doubts, not because he desires that there be no religion, but because he cannot conscientiously admit a criterion of truth, ought not to open his lips ; for whatever he may utter, will in some way contradict the assertions which he takes for granted and on which he reasons.

It is still worse when reason becomes so perverted as to scoff at the truth of religion. Shaftsbury says : If any religious doctrine can be exposed to ridicule, it must certainly contain a falsehood. Wit, it cannot be denied, is a dangerous enemy to religion. Where it exists, deep and serious meditation are always absent. We wish to reflect on a subject, but a witty thought presents itself and renders it ridiculous and we are done with it ; instead of meditating on it, we laugh at it. Lucian wielded all the weapons of sarcasm and wit against the Greek superstition very skillfully, and many have attacked the Christian religion with similar weapons. But whilst Lucian succeeded, they have failed ; the caustic rays of their wit have reflected back upon themselves, like arrows upon the breast of the archer. The reason is manifest. True wit must always stand far above that on which it pours its shafts. Now, he that would expose the Christian religion to ridicule, must stand

above and beyond divine wisdom. Hence none of those who have attempted to destroy the confidence of Christians by ridiculing their doctrines, have succeeded. They may have scoffed at their own notions of these doctrines, but the doctrines themselves, the truth contained in them, their wit could not reach. Their sarcasm almost universally recoiled upon themselves, and the proverb could be applied : “ *He that laughs last, laughs best.* ” Hobbes—to give an instance or two—during the day ridiculed the idea that there is a God, but when night came he was so much afraid of ghosts that he dared not sleep alone. A celebrated physician, who frequently laughed at the doctrine of the soul and its immortality, when lying sick of the gout, employed a conjurer to exorcise the demons from his limbs.

IV.

Finally, let me show in a few words, *that reason and faith mutually support and advance each other.*

The contents of faith are, on the one hand, the sin of man, and, on the other, his redemption from it, and eternal salvation through Jesus Christ. That all men are fallen and suffer under the curse of hereditary sin, has always been admitted. It has been the theme of Poetry ; the most beautiful productions of human imagination, the poems of Dante, of Tetrarch, Milton and Klopstock, are full of it. This being admitted on all sides, it is but reasonable to believe that He, who would redeem the world from sin, must be free from sin himself ; that the pure cannot proceed from the impure ; and that Christ consequently must come from heaven. So it is likewise reasonable, that He, who would give life to the dead, must have life everlasting in Himself ; that that life must be His by whom are created heaven and earth, the Visible and Invisible, Thrones and Principalities and Powers, by whom and for whom all is created, who is above all and in all. The Saviour of the world, it was reasonable to expect, would be the Son of God ; the Son of God alone could be the Saviour of the world. In short, reason cannot but acknowledge that when man has fallen into a snare, he needs one, not enticed by its allurements, to extricate him ; that when the inward monitor sleeps, we need one who never sleeps and will awaken us—who will help us to

a clear idea of our dangerous situation—who will show us how far inimical powers have led us from the right path, and who will guide us back to it again. When man no longer understands himself, he needs an interpreter of his own language. When man has lost God in his heart, he needs one that visibly represents Him anew. We need the Son of God, who stands before us as a kind and loving brother—who by his Spirit becomes our guide, by his holiness our model, and by his love in life and death the object of our supreme affection.

On the other hand, faith assists reason. Reason left to itself is arrogant, is acted upon by impure motives, is selfish and contracted. Nourished by the senses and wholly depraved, it is inclined to consider the sensual world the only world. But by the Spirit of God reason is regenerated; by faith its views are purified and enlarged and extended beyond the grave; by faith its longing for immortality is satisfied and man's final destination is revealed to it. (Plato, the wisest of ancient philosophers desired and longed for the time, when one wiser than all men would reveal the truth fully.) Faith points out the only worthy aim for the efforts of reason; gives a peace, which the world knows not and in which alone man can find true happiness in life and consolation in the hour of death.

APPLICATION.

In conclusion I desire to make a few practical remarks.

1. And here I would say that, as faith is the only true source of all virtue, infidelity is the fountain of all sin—its seat and root. Without faith we cannot please God; without faith there can be no wisdom, nor justice, nor holiness, nor redemption; without faith there is no love, no faithfulness, no courage, no consolation in our hearts. Without faith the will remains weak, sensuality strong, reason depraved, life vain, the grave awful. Hence it is that infidelity is the most terrible word contained in our language, and to be charged with it can be but ill brooked by any one.

But no one has faith, except the believer in Christ. Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? for He is the true God and eternal life! The Scriptures give witness of Him and contain the Truth; the Spirit, that proceeds from

Him, is the Spirit of Truth ; and the Church established by Him renders this Truth manifest. He who pays no regard to the Scriptures, to the Spirit of Truth and to the ordinances of the Church, does not believe ; he lives without Faith and Truth, in the world of wickedness and falsehood.

2. None can enter the sphere of faith by a mere resolution of the will or by merely taking a proper view of the contents of faith. Faith is the bloom of regeneration, and salvation the fruit of faith. Unless we are regenerated, we have no faith. But regeneration does not merely direct reason to different objects, or correct the defects of the will or mend our moral life : it is a new principle in man, which changes *him*, and not only *something in him* ; which makes him a new creature, and not only remodels some parts in him or revives some of his powers. The regenerated person knows what Truth is, because he is of the Truth ; he knows by whom he is called, for the Spirit in him will tell him ; he knows the voice of Christ, because he listens for it—loves it.

APPENDIX.

AN ESSAY on the *Life, Character and Writings of JOHN B. GIBSON, LL. D., lately Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.* By William A. Porter. Philadelphia : T. & J. W. Johnston. 1855.

IN Perry county, Pa.,—which until 1820, was a portion of Cumberland county,—on one of the old roads leading, most of the way along the rugged and shady banks of the Sherman's creek, to Landisburg, one of the oldest settlements of the valley and the first county seat, is a place still familiarly known as “Gibson's,” because still occupied by some of the descen-

dants of the family. It is a quiet romantic nook, formed by the curvature of the towering pine-clad hills, just below a narrow pass which leads out into the more spacious and fruitful valley which lies to the west. A small stone mill which bears the marks of time and of fire, the ruins of several small out-buildings, a finger board pointing in several directions on the roads leading out through the ravines, and a tolerably comfortable dwelling are now the principal artificial features of the place. A little distance below, an immense rock, or pile of rocks, whose base starts at the edge of the water, towers high into the air. About fifty feet from its base the road passes directly through its side, and as the traveler approaches this cut, and casts a suspicious eye towards the beetling crag overhanging him far above, and hears the roaring of the Sherman as it dashes upon the rocks of the deep gorge below, he will be fortunate if he escape an involuntary shudder. This is known, far and near, as "Gibson's rock."

The reader will have already anticipated the purport of this description. The scene itself is worthy of an artist's pencil. On a bright summer afternoon as the sun declines to the west, and his beams, flashing on the rippling waters, catch the eye through the openings in the umbrageous canopy of leaves, and the huge forms of nature repose in an almost oppressive silence on every hand, it forms a scene which would perhaps outrival many that are more widely celebrated. But it has a deeper and better interest to the initiated. It marks the birth-place of one of Pennsylvania's greatest ornaments—of one who, in the language of a competent judge, has been thought, even abroad, to have been for many years "the great glory of his native State." In its leading features it resembles the birth-place of James Buchanan, in the western angle of Franklin county, amid the same range of mountains, not fifty miles distant, in a narrow pass known as "the Gap," through which the pack-horses in "auld lang syne," defiled to "Fort Pitt" and the "far west." When John Bannister Gibson, who was destined to wear with unapproachable success and honor, the judicial ermine of Pennsylvania, was about leaving his wild mountain home on the banks of the Sherman, to enter an al-

ready well known classical institution of his native county, James Buchanan, who in another sphere, was destined to gain the honorable distinction of "Pennsylvania's favorite son," was prattling with the rough packers in "the Gap," and strolling (so says an irresponsible tradition) with a small bell tied round his neck, in the neighboring woods.* When the history of Pennsylvania comes to be written—and it must be written some day; for her advantageous position in the Union, her inexhaustible resources, the blended and sterling character of her population, alike removed by constitutional bias from the extremes of head-long and impracticable impetuosity, and phlegmatic stagnation, necessitate for her a healthy development, a high position, and a commanding influence,—when this history comes to be written, few, if any, names will appear in it with more prominence than those of the boy from the valley of the Sherman, and the bell-boy of the Gap,—for the history of a State or a nation is always inseparable from the history of its great men.

We take pleasure in introducing here the following verses, written in advanced life (we believe) by Chief Justice Gibson. They will be found in "The Model American Courier" of Nov. 19, 1853, though they were originally published at an earlier date.

RETROSPECTION

On revisiting the dilapidated Birth-place of the writer, after an absence of many years.

(A FIRST AND LAST ATTEMPT.)

BY JOHN BANNISTER GIBSON.

The home of my youth stands in silence and sadness;
None that tasted its simple enjoyments are there;
No longer its walls ring with glee and with gladness;
No strain of blithe melody breaks on the ear.

The infantile sport in the shade of the wild-wood,
The father who smiled at the games of the ball,

* We would suggest to some of our unemployed *littérateurs* that a very readable, and to many minds, a fascinating book might be written upon the "Birth-places of Distinguished Men," selecting mainly those characterized by their obscurity,—a peculiarity confined almost entirely to this country, and one of by no means rare occurrence—or by the note-worthy incidents or associations connected with them.

The parent still dearer who watch'd o'er my childhood,
Return not again at Affection's fond call.

And the garden—fit emblem of youth's fading flowers!
No fawn-footed urchin now bounds o'er its lawn :
The young eyes that beam'd on its rose-cover'd bowers,
Are fled from its arbors—forever are gone.

Why memory cling thus to life's jocund morning?
Why point to its treasures exhausted too soon?
Or tell that the buds of the heart at the dawning,
Were destin'd to wither and perish at noon?

On the past, sadly musing, oh pause not a moment;
Could we live o'er again but one bright sunny day,
'Twere better than ages of present enjoyment,
In the mem'ry of scenes that have long pass'd away.

But Time ne'er retraces the footstep he measures;
In fancy alone with the Past we can dwell:
Then take my last blessing, lov'd scene of young pleasures,
Dear home of my childhood—forever farewell.*

* We add a few stanzas from another pen, not because of their merit as poetry, but because of their coincidence in locality and sentiment.

Sherman, how sweet thy crystal flow,
How soothing and how dear
The murmurs of thy waters fall
Upon my listening ear.
Beneath this ancient Beechen tree,
Where oft before I stood,
In childhood's happy days of love,
I gaze upon thy flood,
Whose swelling tide with tuneful course
Glides tranquilly along,
And murmurs with responsive tone,
Each gladsome woodland song.

My thoughts grow tranquil as I look,
Upon thy tranquil tide;
Each heavy paining of the breast
Doth calmly here subside;
And now I feel as oft my heart,
In other days has felt,
When thoughtlessly upon thy banks,
To pluck the flower I knelt.
There's something swells within me, and
The lovely fitful sound
Of some strange seraphine doth float
My beating heart around;

In this now "dilapidated" dwelling lived Col. George Gibson for some time previous, and also subsequent to, the Revolutionary war. He was of Scotch Irish descent,—a vigorous, sturdy and intelligent race, who took first possession of Sherman's Valley in common with other and better portions of

Like angel melodies of hope
Upon an exile's ear;
When wand'ring in a stranger's land
Nor friend, nor warm heart near.

It is the sound, the trembling strain
From other days of love,
When on thy banks from noon to night
My feet were wont to rove,—
Sweet days of Eden happiness,
When fairy Hope was young,
And knew no other harmony
Than what Fulfilment sung.
Thou wakest in my busy breast
Ten thousand melodies;
And I review the distant past,
While tears bedim my eyes,
When long years start in swift array,
With many a former scene,
All beautiful and lovely, as
A fairy's summer dream.

Thou art not changed, oh lovely stream,
Since last I trod thy side,
Or with the fisherman's rude skiff
Skimmed o'er thy glassy tide;
Here still the stout old hickories
Point to the smiling sky,
And from the glen in shrilly tone
I hear the wild jay cry:
On gloomy Pisgah's[†] cloud-capt brow
The mournful breezes moan
Through the tall oaks and hoary pines
In melancholy tone;
Enchanting sound! enchanting scene!
Would I might ever stay,
Sweet Sherman, by thy tranquil tide,
Till life shall fade away.

"YOUTH'S PHANTASIES," BY C. H. A.

[†] The local name of the mountain which rises abruptly from the stream just opposite "Gibson's rock."

middle Pennsylvania. His family name in Scotland was Gilbertson. He had strong native genius; was celebrated as a humorist and wit, but with little talent to advance his fortune except in the army, for which alone he was fitted. Through his influence and pecuniary generosity,* the pass was cut through the great rock which bears his name by which he and his neighbors found egress to the county seat at Carlisle. He served with distinction in the war of the Revolution. He commanded a regiment at the defeat of St. Clair in 1791, and expired on the field on that memorable day, covered with honorable wounds. His wife, who was Anne, daughter of Francis West, and four children survived him. The essay named at the head of this article is in error when it says that "Francis and William, the elder two, died at an early age." Francis is still living, an octogenarian, at the old "Birth-place," and was quite a character in the sphere in which he moved. He had perhaps as much raw intellect as any member of the family. His fine contour of head and mass of brain strikingly resembled that of the Chief Justice. He was noted as a wit and satirist; also for his utter disregard of the conventionalities and many of the proprieties of life; for his mechanical ingenuity, and his passion for, and his unequalled skill (in his neighbors' reckoning) upon the violin. General George Gibson, the other surviving brother, has for many years held an important post in the United States army. John Bannister, was the youngest of the family and was born Nov. 8th, 1780. In writing to John William Wallace, Esq., of Philadelphia, Judge Gibson, under date of Carlisle, July 7th, 1851, gives the following description of his early life. "I was born among the mountains of Cumberland. * * * Fox-hunting, fishing, gunning, rifle-shooting, swimming, wrestling and boxing with the natives of my age, were my exercises and my amusements. My mother, who having been educated in Philadelphia, was qualified for the task, directed my reading, and put such books into my hand as were proper for me. We had from one to two hundred volumes, Burke's Annual Register included, and I read all of them so often, that they are as fresh

* See a file of the first paper published in Carlisle for a letter over his signature.

in my memory as if I had read them yesterday. My poor mother struggled with poverty during the nineteen years she lived after my father's death, and having fought up gallantly against it, till she had placed me at the bar—died."* How vast has been the influence of that mother's courage and toil upon the State and country of her adoption!

We shall group together here, without amplification, the leading chronological events in the life of Judge Gibson. He entered the Grammar School of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., in the Spring of 1795, and the college itself about two years afterwards, over which then presided the learned Charles Nisbet, D. D. He graduated, it is presumed, in 1800 or 1801, the destruction of the College buildings in 1804 having destroyed the record. On leaving College he studied law with Thomas Duncan, of Carlisle, afterwards with himself to occupy a seat upon the Supreme Bench,—a name, says Mr. Porter which "occupies a respectable place in our judicial annals." He was admitted to the bar in 1803, and entered upon the practice of law in Carlisle, afterwards for a short time in Beaver, Pa., then in Hagerstown, Md.,† and then returned to Carlisle, where he continued to practice until 1813, when he was appointed President Judge of the eleventh Judicial District composed of the counties of Tioga, Bradford, Susquehanna and Luzerne. In the meantime he had made a brief experiment in political life. In 1810 he was elected by the Democratic party of Cumberland county, a member of the Legislature, and served as such in the sessions of 1810—11, and

* *Essay, &c.*, page 18.

† The following little piece of information is curious. Who can explain it? The denizens of Hagerstown are wont to claim for it the character of "no mean city." "It is known to his friends," says Mr. Porter, p. 21, "that he always refused to include in the computation of his age, the time he spent in Hagerstown. It is related on good authority, that having on one occasion, in the presence of his brethren of the bench, who knew his age exactly, stated it at somewhat less than it really was, and resolutely re-affirmed it, a calculation was proposed, and readily assented to by himself. They started with the date of his admission to the bar, with his stay in Carlisle, and were about to include the time spent in Hagerstown, when the Judge with good-humored violence broke up the count, and refused to let it proceed—inveighing strongly against the injustice of charging him with that item of time, and assigning numerous reasons, which it will not be necessary to chronicle here."

1811—12. Here his commanding presence and opening intellect secured some measure of notice and he was chiefly instrumental in the passage of several important acts. In 1816 he was appointed by Governor Snyder one of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court in the room of the eccentric Hugh H. Brackenridge, deceased. He had now found his place and he kept it for life. In 1827, on the death of Judge Tilghman, he was commissioned Chief Justice, which position he retained until 1851. In 1851, under the operation of the newly introduced principle of an elective Judiciary, he was elected one of the five Supreme Judges, and died invested with the high office he had so long held, at Philadelphia, May 3rd, 1858.

A great mind is always a subject of study,—generally for admiration. Like Niagara or Vesuvius, its massive grandeur attracts alike the eye of the divine, the statesman, the poet, the philosopher and the man of ordinary practical intelligence; or like the giant elm of centuries amid the smaller trees of the forest, it is the “observed of all observers,” whilst weaker creatures find shelter and protection within the folds of its mighty arms. Living, productive thought, in any sphere, is a commodity of priceless worth. For these reasons we offer no apology for introducing a paper upon Chief Justice Gibson into this periodical. Theologian, or literary man, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, he was not; but he was a great intellect, and, (which is nearer the drift of our Review) he was in the organic structure of his mind a great philosopher.

Of the Essay by Mr. Porter, we would say here, briefly, that it is a respectable, but by no means an adequate performance. It displays considerable discrimination and accuracy of criticism, and we think touches truthfully upon the strong points of its subject's mind and character; but it is not exhaustive; and the selections from his published opinions give mere glimpses of the workings of his mind. An intellect like Judge Gibson's, and a long life of such eminence as was awarded him, cannot be disposed of in an octavo of 140 pages. We agree with Mr. Porter, that it is remarkable that no more has been written respecting him since his death, and we hope that the Essay before us may be the forerunner of a comprehensive and com-

plete Life, embodying an extensive selection from his writings. True, his mind stands sculptured in monumental grandeur in his published judicial opinions, running through seventy volumes of the Pennsylvania State Reports, from 2 Sergeant and Rawle to 7 Harris; and no detrition of time, nor heavings and tossings of the political hemisphere, which shall span at all the fabric of our jurisprudence, will be able to destroy it as it there stands. But in this form it will be confined to the offices of lawyers; whilst we are persuaded that the Nestor of the bench, "the only Chief whom the hearts of the people would know," even after he assumed officially a lower position, ought in his posthumous influence to be brought nearer to the people themselves. We are persuaded that a selection might be made from Justice Gibson's opinions, and other fugitive writings, which would be read by that portion of all classes and professions, who are accustomed to seek and peruse the highest productions of the human mind.

One of the most interesting points in the life of Judge Gibson is the history of the *development of his mind*. As there are certain great classes or types of mind which can be arranged together with almost generic accuracy, so there are minds which require peculiar *occasions* for development. Other minds seem to have a sort of spontaneity of expansion. They develop from the free working of their own inherent powers, without the aid of any extraneous stimuli. But it is not so with all; and it often appears doubtful whether this other class would develop at all, in any measure correspondent with their native capability, without the stimuli of occasion and circumstance. To this latter class the mind of Gibson belonged. His bodily habit was phlegmatic, and it had its influence upon his mind and contributed, doubtless, to the lateness* of the mature development of his powers, as well as hazarded their development upon the accidents of occasion. Although, as Mr. Porter says, the burning of Dickinson College destroyed all record of his progress there, yet tradition has preserved some scraps which those who knew him in after life will regard as easily credible.

* Another modern instance of late development is that of Arch Bishop Hughes.

He was called notoriously lazy, and was often almost wholly indifferent about the regular tasks of the course; but his classmates well knew that when he roused himself, under the pressure of a special emergency, he could surpass them all. He was, moreover, the butt of a good deal of innocent ridicule. He was long-legged, raw-boned, and awkward, and furnished the point to many a jest,—though it is remembered that due care was always exercised, by those who had come to know him, not to carry the fun beyond the point of endurance. At College, though all the discerning noticed his spasmodic ability, he was generally regarded as a student who had not much “out come” in him. That he was at first almost wholly unsuccessful at the bar, might be inferred from his numerous and rapid changes,—from Carlisle to Beaver, from Beaver to Hagerstown, from Hagerstown back to Carlisle, all in the space of a little more than two years. We fancy that but few young advocates in such circumstances would not begin to fear that they had missed their calling. He had indeed missed his calling, but he was on the stepping stone to it. He never would have made a successful advocate. The movements of his mind were not rapid enough; he had not patience enough to wade through the wilderness of dry facts which the thoroughly furnished attorney must thread; his profound dealing with the seminal principles of law and justice, had he ever attained to this in the sphere of an advocate, would have been over the heads of most juries; he had little or none of that popular tact for influencing juries,* which multitudes even of infinitely inferior men possess; and above all, the profession of attorney would not have afforded stimulus, propulsive force enough, to

* “No man has who heard John Sergeant, for example, in a deliberative assembly, or before a court in banc, or even in a consultation where his great wisdom placed him out of the reach of common men, could form any opinion of his powers until he heard him before a jury. It was only when in a case largely affecting character or property, when in his peculiar attitude he drew close to the jury, his frame agitated, his eye flashing and his voice choked by excitement almost to a whisper, you could see how tremendous a grasp he was capable of taking of the very hearts of his hearers. It is true, that without profound legal learning, this power could no more be exerted in a court of justice than a man could fly without wings, but with the profoundest learning alone it could no more be exercised than a man could fly with wings. It is a mysterious and indescribable faculty.”—*Essay, &c., p. 81-82.*

have driven him onwards in the path of development. He would have wasted his powers upon inferior pursuits. "He was born a musician," says Chief Justice Black in his eulogy of him; and Mr. Porter gives the following which dates during his stay, as a practitioner in Carlisle. "In respect to his deportment to his clients, a rumor has prevailed so widely and with such universal credit as to warrant its repetition here. It is said that he had become at this time, as he ever afterwards continued, a votary of music, and that when clients knocked at the front door, the sound was frequently overcome by the strains which proceeded from a violin in the hidden recesses of the office. I am unable to vouch for the entire correctness of the story, or to recommend it as an example for imitation. If true, the instance was unique." Who knows but that if he had been allowed to jog on with a sufficient measure of success to keep him above want, amid his fiddling and drawing, his great intellect would have slumbered in its latency, like his brother Frank's, or only burst out occasionally like a half-extinct volcano, showing to men that there was a hidden power there which was not always at work in its mightiness.

It is said to be a fact, capable of being substantiated by the specification of numerous instances, that the best Judges, both in England and America, have been furnished in men who were not eminent as practitioners. And the fact need not astonish; for not only are the two spheres in many respects wholly different, but some of the highest qualifications of mind, which unfit for the practice of law, are precisely those which qualify for the highest functions of the Judge. A fact somewhat analogous is found in another sphere, viz.: that the ablest and best Professors of Theology, and writers upon theological and kindred topics, have been furnished in men who almost entirely failed as popular preachers.

We shall endeavor to mark the effect of the several extraneous occasions, which gave impetus to the development of the mind of Mr. Gibson. How he got into the House of Representatives we have no direct means of knowing; but we suspect it was the work of interested friends, who knew him well, and deemed an experiment necessary, in his case. The change

seems to have been not without effect ; for there is not a little in the position of a Legislator to rouse a phlegmatic mind, if it be really capable of great things. He took at least a useful part in the business of the House ; and on one occasion he took a decided stand with a very small minority, and made himself conspicuous, by placing on record a written protest against the Legislative address to Governor Snyder, (27th March, 1811,) for the removal of Judge Thomas Cooper of the Eighth Judicial District, afterwards Professor in Dickinson College, and President of Columbia College, South Carolina.

Doubtless Mr. Gibson's legislative career was instrumental to his first appointment to the Bench. He now entered a new sphere, and his true sphere,—the aptness of which to develop his best powers, we shall see by and by. It requires no effort of the imagination to suppose that the responsibility of the Judgeship resting upon one of his age, (he was not quite 33) who doubtless felt the inadequacy of his own attainments, would rouse his mind to unwonted effort, and compel him not only to think but to study. How he discharged his duties we do not know. He began, however, to attract the attention of the eminent in the profession. But tradition is again in character when it reports, that he exhibited "too much impulsive-ness in his judgments, both of legal affairs and of human nature."

His appointment to the Supreme Bench, as an Associate Justice, three years after his first appointment, seems really to have been the first thing that fully roused his intellect, and fired his ambition. He now commenced to study in earnest. He seems to have formed the resolution,—a resolution the offspring of a mind at length made conscious of the possession of a vast but slumbering power,—to make himself master of the law as a science. He resolved to go down among the lowest foundations of that system, upon the higher scaffolding of which he was now called to labor as an architect ; that acquainting himself well with the shape and structure of the whole building, he might know precisely how to lay on each additional stone. He withdrew himself to a great extent from general society ; he wore often a look of abstraction, and indifference to per-

sons and things around him, and he devoted himself to the most difficult authors with an assiduity which most astonished those who knew him best. All the evidence to be had in the case seems to indicate that his study of the profounder and more difficult principles of the science, was mainly pursued within a few years after his elevation to the Bench of the Supreme Court.

A moment's consideration will show how admirably adapted was the position he now occupied to afford the exciting occasion which such a mind as his needed. Not only was it the height of the elevation ; which indeed would have been sufficient to have stimulated an ordinarily sluggish ambition, but there were other and better, and in his case, more potent influences which it brought to bear upon him. A judge is required to investigate, not that he may carry a cause, but that he may discover the right ; and in him, constitutionally, there was such an intense love of right and justice, such a horror of injustice, such a scrupulously delicate sensitiveness as to the relation in which he stood to justice awarded or injustice committed, that this itself was sufficient to arouse all the energies of his nature to the work of securing the requisite data for ascertaining the right. In the Supreme Court a succession of the most important cases, involving the greatest possible variety of feature and combination, and evolving almost every principle of civil and common law, was continually passing in review before him, and challenging the regard both of his head and his heart. There was thus, ever and anon, bearing upon him a pressure which goaded him on in the career of self-development. One fact is noticeable in his published opinions—and it confirms the theory we have just given—that all the strength of his mind was sure to gather itself up, and rise into irresistible energy dashing opposition to pieces like the force of a battering-ram, when to a case giving room for the play of great principles, was added something which aroused his indignation—some persecution of injured innocence, some plausible but wrongful evasion of law, or some attempt to take advantage of technicalities for the perpetration of injustice. A good instance of this, (they might be indefinitely multiplied) occurs

to us in the case of *Logan vs. Mason*, 6 Watts and Sergeant, p. 10,—and Mr. Porter cites another, *Sauerman vs. Weckerly*, 17 Sergeant and Rawle, p. 116.

His appointment to the office of Chief Justice was the last powerful stimulus which his mind received, which though not different in kind from that under which he had been moving for ten years, was different in degree; and from it his powers seem to have received fresh impulse. He was now at an age at which many men have reached, if not passed, the acme of their power, but he was yet far from his. From this time forward the chief improvement is seen in his style, and the condensation of thought exhibited in his opinions. His style now began to assume a massiveness, compactness and polish, which bespeak unerringly, the concentration of mind which his habits of study were acquiring for him. "His original style compared to that in which he now began to write, was like the sinews of a growing lad compared to the well knit muscles of a man. No one who has carefully studied his productions can have failed to remark the increased power and pith which distinguish them from this time forward. The gradual and uniform progress of his mind may be traced in his opinions, with a certainty and satisfaction which are probably not afforded in the case of any other judge known to our annals."*

In coming to speak of Judge Gibson's official acts—his legal decisions and opinions—and his influence upon the jurisprudence of Pennsylvania, we are approaching a subject only to take leave of it without any adequate treatment. This must be left to a more competent hand, and larger space in which to do it. A brief outline, and an instance or two must suffice. When it is remembered that Judge Gibson took his seat upon the Bench in the infancy of our jurisprudence as a State, and that it grew up with him, and received to a great extent its moulding from his plastic hand, it will be seen how difficult it would be to speak of his labors in detail in a brief compass. But this relation of his to it, is of itself vastly significant. To use an expression of his own in *Lyle vs. Richbards* with a differ-

* *Essay, &c.*, p. 51.

ent application, it was in his power to lay his hands on it, and "while it was yet in the griestle, to bend it and mould it at his pleasure." When Judge Gibson ascended the bench the compass of our jurisprudence was vastly narrower than now. All the forms and interests of society, industrially, politically and legally were far less complicated than at present. Questions arose and decisions were required during the course of his labors which could not possibly have had a precedent. Forty years ago we had no commercial law. The State had then no chartered bank out of Philadelphia, and only three in that city. Partnership, negotiable paper, insurance, transportation, and liability in general were terms of very different meaning and application then from what they bear now. The two main departments of the law were those of special pleading and real estate. Much of the business of the courts consisted in the settlement of titles of land. With these his studies chiefly commenced, and he not only completely mastered them afterwards, but mastered, we might almost say created, other branches as they arose. It was his thorough understanding of the system, and his confidence in his own perceptions of the beautiful, that emboldened him to declare in the face of the criticism which he knew it would evoke, that "he knew no more beautiful system, nor one more founded on principles of general equity, than the land laws of Pennsylvania."* When we remember that such was Pennsylvania jurisprudence then, and glance at what it is now, and remember that for near forty years he was the leading mind on the bench of its highest tribunal,—the one whose opinions are quoted as authority more frequently than those of all his contemporaries put together,—it will give us a bird's-eye view of what he has done.

* "Old gentlemen in the country, who had been all their lives trying the titles to land, adjusted anew their cravats, and looked more grave than ever, in the sudden consciousness that they had been engaged in building up, not only a system, but a beautiful system. Practitioners in the metropolis, on the other hand, who had almost no practical acquaintance with the supposed system, sneered at it as a mere budget of augers, a collection of sharp points and short corners, having no pretension to form or comeliness. Certainly it does require a higher degree of charity than that usually ascribed to legal minds, to admit that the land laws of Pennsylvania form a system, and a much higher degree to predicate of it, the term beautiful."—*Essay, &c., p. 83.*

But our business is rather with the man himself as an object of study and portraiture ; and we will only tarry longer to notice briefly two instances in which his decisions stand immediately related to great public interests. The first is that which aided to settle the law of Pennsylvania on the subject of riots. Here we shall quote the language of Mr. Porter.

"The people of the State, and perhaps of the Union, will not soon forget the popular commotions which prevailed in Philadelphia between the years 1836 and 1846. We had the Abolition riots, the Railroad riots, the Negro riots, the Weavers' riots, the Native American riots, and the Military riots. Having run short of names, territorial designations were adopted, and we had the Moyamensing, Southwark, and Kensington riots. Interspersed with these, were the riots of various fire companies, who seemed to have achieved little distinction until their members had been bound over to each successive term of the Quarter Sessions. Learned jurists were at work in the meantime. It was easily shown that this disorder was all wrong—that the power to suppress it must exist somewhere—that the sheriff could employ both civil and military power—that all citizens were bound to obey his requisition—that peaceable citizens were more numerous than the disorderly—that the riots could therefore be put down, and must be put down. Editors, lawyers, judges and philosophers all agreed in opinion, and resolved that there must be no more riots. This was very well, but the riots continued. Good citizens ascertained that if they disobeyed the sheriff's summons, they would be fined, and if they complied with it, their heads would be broken, and with strange contempt for the law, and unaccountable forgetfulness of their civil duties, they preferred to encounter the fine."

* * * * *

"The commotions of 1844 filled up the measure of our shame. Two churches, a school house, and numerous private dwellings were reduced to ashes. All men felt that the time had come when the law must do something, if it could do anything. Inferior tribunals quailed before the mob spirit, and the mass of the rioters arrested were acquitted and discharged. An oppor-

tunity now presented itself to the Chief Justice to display his powers. The Act of 31st May, 1841, founded on that of Geo. I., authorized the owners of property in the County of Philadelphia, destroyed by this species of violence, to bring suits against the county for the injuries sustained, and numerous suits were brought under the authority of the Act. The case of *Donoghue vs. The County*, was the first on the list, and the Chief Justice held the Court. His charge was worthy of the man, and of the occasion. No one who heard it can forget its influence on the case, or on the subsequent cases, and on the community. One of the chief defences set up, that armed men had fired on the crowd from the building afterwards burned, was demolished with a boldness, an energy, and an eloquence rarely surpassed in judicial proceedings. He discarded utterly the distinction which had been taken between defending a dwelling house and church, and held that a man has the same right to defend and to take life in defence of the place in which he worships God, as of the domicile which shelters his family. He carried the doctrine even further, and applied it to the school contiguous to the church, in which the children were receiving their education. In the meagre scrap of the charge which is reported in 2 Barr, 231, this is sufficiently evident. The result was a verdict in favor of the plaintiff for the whole amount of the property destroyed. A similar result followed in the case of the Hermits of St. Augustine vs. The County, Brightly's Reports, 116; and in that of the St. Michael's Church vs. the County, Brightly's Reports, 121. Of a different verdict in the first case, on that turning point between the dominion of law and the dominion of violence, no man could have ventured to predict the result. From that time to this, we have had no riots. Other causes have contributed to produce this state of things; but no one act tended more directly to restore permanent good order and to re-establish popular confidence in the people themselves, than the manly and patriotic course of Judge Gibson in the case of *Donoghue vs. The County*. Business men began to feel that if they were certainly liable to pay their own proportion of the property thus destroyed, it was their pecuniary interest to require its preservation. Lawless men found that they inflicted

no injury on the objects of their violence when the property destroyed was paid for at its highest value. Patriotic men, both at home and abroad, were glad to discover in these proceedings, fresh evidence of the power which a wise and benevolent system of law, administered by an enlightened judge, may exert among a free people."

The other case is that well known as the "Presbyterian Church case." In 1801 a "Plan of Union" was adopted between the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and the General Association of Connecticut (Congregational) which was designed to secure the cööperation of these two branches of the Protestant Church, in their missionary work in the "new settlements." But like all unions which grow not out of a community of organic life, it was found to generate trouble and discord. The effort to amalgamate principles "as immiscible as water and oil," (to quote Judge Gibson) only operated to damage both of them. An element was introduced into the Presbyterian Church which was foreign to its organic life,—an element which could not be assimilated and must be thrown off. This was what the Assembly of 1837 did in passing what are known as "the excinding acts"—legislative ordinances by which the "Plan of Union" was dissolved and the Synods of Utica, Genessee, Geneva and Western Reserve, which grew out of the said Plan, declared "to be out of the ecclesiastical connection of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America," and the Presbyterian elements in said Synods ordered to "attach themselves to the nearest Presbyteries." These acts formed a party in the Presbyterian Church, resolved to assert the prerogatives of the excinded Synods, and the "tug of war" came in the General Assembly of 1838. At this Assembly commissioners from the four Synods presented themselves, and the Assembly refusing to acknowledge them, a revolutionary party undertook to seize the reins of ecclesiastical government, organized themselves as the *General Assembly*, and after retiring to a separate room proceeded to exercise all the supposed functions of the Assembly. Among these was the election of their own trustees to secure the perpetuity of the corporation under the Laws of Pennsylvania. The

trustees elected by the former Assemblies and by the other Assembly (the Old School) refused to surrender to their rivals "the franchises, offices, privileges and liberties" conferred upon them by law as "Trustees of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." Upon this refusal an action at law was brought, and the case tried before Judge Rogers and a special jury at the Nisi Prius for Philadelphia, on the 4th day of March 1839. The case was one "without precedent and presenting some extraordinary features," and it occasioned intense interest in every part of the Union. The Nisi Prius jury, under the charge of Judge Rogers, found a verdict against the defendants, which, if it had stood, would have had the effect of declaring the trustees elected by the New School body the true, legal and proper trustees of the General Assembly. Sixty-five reasons for a new trial were filed and the case argued the same month before the court in banc, and the Chief Justice pronounced the opinion of the court. Their decision made the rule for a new trial absolute. Here we quote Mr. Porter:

"If the reader possess any partisan views of the subject, it is quite probable that in this case, as in others, they will influence his estimate of the result which was reached; but I see not how any one familiar with the best efforts of the human mind in the solution of difficult questions of law or morals, can fail to admire the powers of analysis and condensation which the opinion of Judge Gibson in that case displays. He threads his way with a confidence and skill almost matchless, through constitutions, systems of church polity, plans of union, maxims of ecclesiastical government, books of discipline, rules, orders, motions, debates, synods, presbyteries, congregations, and associations, some of them referring to nearly a century of time, and all of them evidently unknown to him before the argument. Any one who has read the case, can scarcely be surprised that the opinion of the Judge should have had the effect of preventing all other litigation on the subject."

That opinion (see 4 Wharton, p. 598) is indeed a masterpiece. Its opening sentence is eminently characteristic and shows how vigorously his powerful mind had been working

through the case; "To extricate the question from the multifarious mass of irrelevant matter in which it is enclosed," &c. The case we believe to have been one eminently suited to his peculiar powers, and none but he could have dealt with it so thoroughly. He shows, with most searching analysis, that the abrogation of the "Plan of Union" as a legislative act of the Assembly was perfectly constitutional and valid; that the commissioners from the excinded Synods were not entitled to seats in the Assembly after the act of 1837; that the proceedings of the minority in the Assembly of 1838 were in violation of the established order, and hence a forfeiture of constitutional rights and titles; and that their trustees were not trustees of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, which though not itself a corporation is the reproductive organ of corporate succession, according to its charter.

In this decision and opinion, Judge Gibson rendered a service of incalculable importance to the whole country. The finding of the Nisi Prius jury would have perpetuated a great and most flagrant wrong. It would have put a schismatical and revolutionary branch in possession of the true lineal succession of the Presbyterian Church, so far as that could be done by the civil law. It would have legitimated revolution and disorder, and might have proved the entering wedge to consequences of which it would have been impossible to have foreseen the end.

It remains to us now to attempt a comprehensive summary of the leading traits of Chief Justice Gibson's mind and character.

We have already intimated his possession of *aesthetical* taste and talent. These were of a high order. His musical talent—a family heir-loom—was highly cultivated. "He was," says Chief Justice Black, "a *connoisseur* in painting and sculpture." He could sketch with great rapidity and with peculiar skill. In the 17th Volume of the Port Folio (1824) page 327, is an engraving of the monument erected to the memory of Dr. Nisbet, in the burial ground at Carlisle, Pa., "for the drawing of which," says the editor, "we are indebted to the pencil of our friend, J. B. Gibson, Esq., one of the Judges of the Su-

preme Court of this Commonwealth." "He could at any time," says Mr. Porter, "sketch by a few dashes of his pen, admirable likenesses both of men and things. Many a dull speaker who has been encouraged by the energy with which the Judge's pen moved, might have found on his notes, a little more than a most excellent representation of the speaker's face. Occasionally on his forgetting to destroy such efforts, they have been passed around the Bar to the amusement of all but the sketcher and the sketched." Mr. Wm. B. Wood, in his "Recollections of the Stage," remarks that "Chief Justice Gibson's sensibilities and taste in the whole range of the fine arts, music, architecture, painting, statuary and the drama, were hardly inferior to his uncommon intellectual parts."

The *universality* of his accomplishments amid the labors and studies of his high position was very remarkable, and betokens what the Germans would call a many-sided, or universal man. He was familiar with geology and chemistry. He studied medicine carefully and understood it well. He perambulated with the spirit of an amateur the whole round of English literature, especially in the department of the Belles Lettres, and his opinions are occasionally elucidated by quotations from Iago and Falstaff. He was also at home among the ancient classics. "His mind absorbed all kinds of knowledge with scarcely an effort." Like a massive castle of the Middle Ages it showed a broad front and ponderous battlements on every side, and afforded in its respective parts capacious storage for the most diverse commodities.

He combined in an unusual degree the *perceptive* and the *logical* faculties. His intuitions were clear, strong and comprehensive, and his logical processes from ascertained data were sure and steady, though not characterized by the minute syllogistic method of the mere logician. The perceptive or intuitive faculties of his mind predominated, and hence had his calling lay in that sphere he would have been a philosopher of the Platonic rather than of the Aristotelian school. He grasped, with a far reaching intuition, great principles or universal facts, and he took in at once all their bearings and relations, and applied them with matchless and almost unerring skill to

any particular matter in hand. He had little taste or patience for mere hair-splitting ; and though unsurpassed, in his sphere, in the discrimination with which he stated a point, yet he had no fondness for those discriminations which rest on a distinction without a difference. Hence the epithet which most accurately describes his caste of mind, and style, is, philosophical, rather than metaphysical. His mind was well fitted to reflect intelligently on the most elevated subjects of human knowledge, and to represent clearly and coherently the ideas thus attained, whilst at the same time are wanting that overstrained subtlety, fine-spun sophistry, and unintelligible mysticism, which are so common in the department of what is technically called metaphysics. Metaphysics owes its parentage to Aristotle, philosophy is the offspring rather of the antagonistic school. His intellectual processes have been thus described : " His mental vision took in the whole outline and all the details of the case, and with a bold and steady hand he painted what he saw."* This is the highest exercise of a philosophical mind. Mr. Porter in endeavoring to classify him amongst writers and thinkers, assigns him his place, generically, and correctly enough, among those whose fame rests upon treatises of a philosophical nature ; but he finds no little difficulty, as is common in such cases, in naming one with whom he may exactly liken him. He finds points of resemblance in Johnson, Butler and Edwards, but no likeness. This he finds most nearly in John Foster. On this point we think his accuracy may be successfully challenged. There are doubtless points of resemblance, and these may be traced with much plausibility in some of Foster's Essays, but there are points of great dissimilarity which can scarcely pass under the plea of allowance for the difference of sphere and of subject. There were elements in the structure of Foster's mind which were wholly wanting in Gibson's, and important elements in Gibson's which were wholly wanting in Foster's. In no sphere could Gibson have been found carefully elaborating such palpable absurdities, magnifying unimportant matters into matters of the first importance, and propounding plausi-

* Chief Justice Black's Eulogy, 7 Harris, p. 11.

ble theories for nobody to adopt, as are to be found here and there in the writings of the great essayist. And though we are a great admirer of Foster, and claim for him no second place, among modern writers, in originality and power, yet we are free to assert for the Pennsylvania Chief Justice a sounder and safer mind in its organic structure.

Such being his intellectual conformation, the reader might almost predict, prior to actual ascertainment, what would be the department of his profession for which his powers were specially adapted, and in which his tastes would most luxuriate. To say that he was strikingly deficient in any of the great branches of the law, would be a great mistake, and not in accordance with the universal character of his mind. But he was most at home in the sphere of *constitutional law*. The breadth and comprehensiveness of his views, and his tendency to rely upon the great principles of the science, rather than upon technicalities and decided cases, found here the sphere for their fittest exemplification. "In the fertile and extensive fields of American Constitutional Law, his powers exhibited to advantage the proportions which nature had given them, and he breathed out his great thoughts with the conscious freedom of a man who is master of the very ground which he occupies."^{*}

He was a champion also of the common law. In speaking of Judge Kennedy he once said, "He clung to the common law as a child to its nurse, and how much, he drew from it, may be seen in his opinions, which, by their elaborate minuteness remind us of the overfullness of Coke."[†] Writers of eulogy and biography, as well as poets, sometimes unconsciously draw their own portraits as accurately as those of the departed. In this instance Judge Gibson, leaving out the idea contained in the last member of the sentence, furnished a master stroke for his own portraiture. The common law is the evolution and product of great principles working through successive ages, and it may be called organic, when contrasted with the civil or statutory law, which may be called mechanical.

* *Essay, &c.*, p. 99-100. † *4 Barr*, p. 6.

This statement is sufficient to show into which department the mind of Judge Gibson would naturally fall. In the last thing which he ever wrote, for publication, an essay in the American Law Register for 1853, he uses this language : " Of all legal mechanism, statutory mechanism is the most imperfect;" *

* * " It is always adapted to the circumstances of a single case, in the mind's eye of the constructor ; and when it is required to work on any other, it works badly or not at all."

* * * " The writer of this article is not a champion of the civil law ; * * * * He was born in the school of Littleton and Coke, and he should be sorry to see any but common law doctrines taught in it." The same leanings appear everywhere throughout his opinions, and they are intermingled occasionally with disparaging intimations of the efforts of Justice Story and writers of that school, to infuse too much of the elements of the civil law into our American jurisprudence.

An admirable feature of his character, was his *purity* as a judge. " He was inflexibly honest. The judicial ermine was as unspotted when he laid it aside for the habiliments of the grave, as it was when he first assumed it. I do not mean to award him merely that common-place integrity which it is no honor to have but simply a disgrace to want. He was not only incorruptible, but scrupulously, delicately, conscientiously free from all wilful wrong, either in thought, word or deed." * " No idea opposite to that of his utmost purity as a judge, was ever associated with his name. There was something in his character, conversation, manner and appearance, which would have crushed such a thought in the bud. A man who had approached him for the purpose of corrupting him, would have been as much disposed to fall down before him in an act of homage, as to have attempted to carry out his purpose." †

His *style* has often been spoken of as a model of judicial composition. Perhaps as such it has never been excelled. It combines richness, dignity, force, condensation and clearness in a remarkable manner. It abounds in illustrations, comparisons, metaphors and quoted maxims, but none of these seem

* Eulogy, 7 Harris, p. 13. † Essay, &c., p. 181.

to have been sought, but to spring up unbidden in the spontaneous working of his mind,—they seem indeed at all times to have been a constituent part of his mental processes. He never seemed to choose his language, it was the natural garb in which his thoughts clothed themselves, and the drapery always revealed the exact shape of the body it covered. "He had one faculty of a great poet; that of expressing a thought in language which could never afterwards be paraphrased. When a legal principle passed through his hands, he sent it forth clothed in a dress which fitted it so exactly, that nobody ever presumed to give it any other. Almost universally the syllabus of his opinion is a sentence from itself; and the most heedless student, in looking over Wharton's Digest, can select the cases in which Gibson delivered the judgment, as readily as he would pick out gold coins from among coppers. For this reason it is, that though he was the least voluminous writer of the Court, the citations from him at the bar are more numerous than from all the rest put together. Yet the men who shared with him the labors and responsibilities of this tribunal stood among the foremost in the country for learning and ability. To be their equal was an honor which few could attain; to excel them was a most pre-eminent distinction."*

He seemed to use language at all times as the medium and servant of thought, at best an imperfect one, and one which he felt authorized to bend and re-adjust to suit his purposes. "The thoughts themselves were great thoughts struggling to make themselves felt through words, which, however well chosen, but obstructed them, and which were used at all, only because better could not then be found." He had a habit which is always observable in men of original and profound minds, whose power of conception, perception and mental combination being so much superior to the average of the race, makes language as it is found to exist a meagre and insufficient vehicle of their thoughts,—viz: the habit of manufacturing words, and of using words in unusual significations. Mr. Porter has cited a number of these words, as *unilateral, individ-*

* Eulogy, 7 Harris, p. 12.

uate, manipulating the testimony, convergent intent, &c. In a very cursory examination of some of his opinions, in search of such words, we picked out the following; *questionless, rebuttal, inequity, voidable, intactible, retropulsive, remainderman.* The list might be extended indefinitely.

This habit sometimes gives an undue stateliness to his style, and puts it above the heads of that class of readers who may not be able to resolve his Latin combinations. It suggests also that at some time in his life he had read with admiration the writings of Dr. Johnson. But his style is in a high degree artistic. It bears the impress of his aesthetical taste. It is like the creation of an artist whose power lay, not in airy Greek porticoes and Corinthian friezes, but in massive Roman arches, and ponderous domes, and heavy Gothic buttresses, and clustered pillars.

We are disposed to receive with some abatement, Mr. Porter's statement,—a statement very common among certain orders of critical writers—that a writer's meaning should always be apparent at first sight. Clearness is certainly a desirable quality in authorship, but it must be remembered that it is a relative quality, and depends as much upon the power of perception in the reader as upon the language of the writer. "A man who has never seen the sun," says Calderon, "cannot be blamed for thinking that no glory can exceed that of the moon. A man who has seen neither moon nor sun, cannot be blamed for talking of the unrivalled brightness of the morning star." The mass of readers, accustomed to little else than common place thought, will toss aside a master work upon the highest subjects of human knowledge in disgust at its obscurity, which to a mind capable of comprehending it, will be not only sufficiently clear, but a perennial source of intellectual pleasure. We would undertake to find Mr. Porter any number of readers to whose minds the writings of Calvin, Owen, Locke, Tillotson, (instances cited by him) would not "suggest their meaning at once." Away then with that silly catering to popular ignorance and prejudice, (we speak not of Mr. Porter,) which would compel every original and powerful thinker and writer to write in terms comprehensible by the unthinking and incapable

masses. A great thought struck out in a form comprehensible by only a few, will by and by reach the masses, in a shape suited for them, by the agency of men who could not have originated it. And if a reader finds the production of a great mind obscure, let him diligently consider whether the fault is in the writer or the reader. The great lights of succeeding ages have been those who were pronounced obscure in their own age.

The condensation of Judge Gibson's style is owing partly to his well known method of preparing his opinions. He had a horror of the pen. He seldom wrote except under the pressure of the most absolute necessity. He did all the needful thinking first. This he did in his chamber, on the street, at the table, on the bench, in the public room of his hotel,—any place and every place—and in any attitude which ministered to the sluggishness of his body, and when he seized the pen he rarely laid it aside until the opinion was completed. Such a method, *with such a mind as his*, doubtless added to the compactness and directness of his style. His bold, beautiful and legible hand writing, free from erasure, induced the belief that he transcribed his opinions; which was rarely, if ever done.

Another feature of Judge Gibson's character, which all the testimony concurs to make prominent, was the *benevolence* and *kindness* of his heart. "His was a most genial spirit; affectionate and kind to his friends, and magnanimous to his enemies. Benefits received by him were engraved on his memory as on a tablet of brass; injuries were written in sand. He never let the sun go down upon his wrath."* "There was something in his magnanimity, in his forgiving temper, in his kindly charity, in his capacity to appreciate excellence of any kind, in any form, which despite his apparent unconcern of manner and sluggishness of body, elicited and compelled affection. There was a true fire of the heart which glowed unceasingly, and cast even the splendor of his intellect into the shade. No man ever more cordially despised a cold, calculating, spider-like lawyer, weaving by day his miserable toils,

* Eulogy, 7 Harris, p. 18.

giving up nothing, retaining his grasp on every victim of chance and folly, and employing his powers only for the production of misery and the practice of oppression. No man ever spoke into being with so little effort, ardent and permanent friendship. He sat on the Supreme Bench with twenty-six different judges, none of whom, except Judge Duncan, owed their position to his influence, and almost all of whom, on their accession, were comparative strangers to him, and yet it may be doubted whether the purest and happiest household ever lived in more absolute harmony than he enjoyed in his personal intercourse with his associates."†

We are sorry to be unable to record anything satisfactory respecting the *religious character* of the illustrious subject of the present sketch. In him as a man,—a human denizen of earth—there is everything to admire; in him as an heir of immortality, and a subject of the government and gracious dispensations of God, there is much the want of which we mourn. The evidences which Mr. Porter has gathered of a religious element in his nature, are very meagre,—his attachment to the doctrines of the Episcopal Church, his occasional emotion under the preaching of the Gospel, and a letter of condolence to a gentleman who had been bereaved of a most excellent mother. Against these, meagre as they are, the great blemish of his character, profanity,—also a family heir-loom—is a sad offset. We fear that like many of the leading minds of the day, engrossed in other pursuits, he passed the subject of religion *sub silentio.*

We venture a remark in conclusion respecting the principle of an elective judiciary which was engrafted on the Constitution of Pennsylvania in the years 1848, 1849 and 1850. We shall not attack it on its broadest ground, nor speak of it as an indication of that radical tendency of the age which has been gradually putting the power more immediately into the hands of the people, and thus changing our republicanism more and more into pure democracy; we shall interrogate it upon only one point,—can such a man as Judge Gibson, or any other

† *Essay, &c., p. 127.*

man, be kept, under this principle, on the Supreme Bench for thirty-seven years? That the Judiciary may produce such men, and the glory of such distinguished attainment be cast upon the ermine of the Commonwealth, it is absolutely necessary that a seat upon its Bench be not an ephemeral position. Rotation in office would be utterly destructive of any such results. We not only seriously doubt whether Judge Gibson could have been nominated and elected when he was appointed to the Supreme Bench, but we doubt whether he could have been kept there for a succession of years, when in his highest vigor. The highest qualifications of a Judge are of all others those which the people are least able to comprehend or appreciate, and the office is of all others the one which ought to be kept out of the arena of party strife. There is not a political party in this country which would hesitate for a moment to drop the name of such a man as Gibson from its ticket, if in a contest characterised by partisan zeal and clap-trap, he did not seem to have the shallow qualification of availability. His nomination in 1851 was the result of strenuous exertion on the part of a few devoted personal friends, and two votes less than he received in convention would have lost to the State the remainder of his life,—and this with all the prestige of his unequalled career with which to confront the claims of inferior men! *O tempora, O mores.*

Besides, there seems to be in Pennsylvania, as Mr. Porter remarks, a disposition to overthrow rather than to sustain men of distinguished ability. "It has long been the subject of remark both at home and abroad, that it seems only necessary for a man of more than ordinary capacity to appear in the politics of the State, to be struck at by every other politician, both great and small." This narrow jealousy, and green-eyed envy of true greatness, made to bear upon the prejudices of the suspicious multitude, will be perpetually fatal to our production of eminent statesmen, and may forever keep us from having a President, unless some medium man should "wake up some morning and find himself famous." As long as this disposition prevails in Pennsylvania it will be most unfit to select its Supreme Judges, and we shall despair of seeing the repeti-

tion of such a career as that of Chief Justice Gibson. "If the same feeling had prevailed in Virginia and South Carolina, Massachusetts and Kentucky, where then had been the great lights of our firmament?"

There is as much intellectual material in Pennsylvania as in any other of her sister commonwealths. In her population she presents as broad a basis for the development of the highest products of mind as is to be found on this continent. She combines in admirable proportion the two most sterling races which have ever put foot upon these shores—the German and the Scotch-Irish. Nothing but a suicidal policy can dwarf her intellectual development in the bud. Let us hope for the best, and in the mean time let us be thankful for such a beacon-light as the name of JOHN BANNISTER GIBSON.

ART. V.—ABELARD, ABRAHAM, ADAM.

We take pleasure in announcing that the Rev. Dr. Bomberger of Philadelphia has begun the preparation of a "Theological and Religious Encyclopedia" on the basis of "Herzog's Real Encyclopedia für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche." The work will be published in twelve monthly parts by Lindsay & Blakiston, the first to appear during January, 1856, and the whole to comprise two large super royal volumes of about 750 double column pages each. Instead of a translation, it will be rather a free re-production of Herzog under an abridged form, and so modified as to be adapted to the wants of the Church peculiar to America. The undertaking is sustained by the co-operation of several divines and theologians belonging to different Christian denominations. For scientific structure, profound research, extensive learning, and fidelity to Jesus Christ, the work of Herzog, taking the first three volumes as a criterion of the whole, is in advance of all others issued on the Continent of Europe. With

such a basis, the Editor and his coadjutors, can, we believe, produce something truly valuable to fill up a chasm in the theological Literature of the English Language.

The Review has been favored with several articles in advance of the first number, to which we give place both on account of their intrinsic merits and as a specimen of the forthcoming Encyclopedia.—EDS.

ABELARD.

ABELARD (Peter,) a prominent champion of scholasticism, celebrated for his personal attractions, for the romantic interest of his life, and the scientific influence he exerted upon the age in which he lived, was born in Palais, between Nantes and Poictiers, in 1079. His father was a man of rank and opulence, and enjoying himself the advantages of a liberal education, he determined that his son, who gave early indications of an acute and lively genius, should have every opportunity of cultivating and improving his mind. The youth amply repaid the care bestowed upon him by the rapid progress he made in learning. In the ardor of his literary enthusiasm, he relinquished the patrimony to which he was entitled as the oldest son, that he might devote himself entirely to scientific pursuits. Logic soon became his favorite study ; and that he might become thoroughly acquainted with it, as we learn from an unpublished document of his own, and also from a letter of Roscellin recently discovered at Munich, he received instruction from that distinguished advocate of Nominalism at the age of thirteen. In search of learning as a sort of literary adventurer, he was at length drawn to Paris by the fame of William of Champeaux, who was at the head of the school of strict Realism. Here his penetrating mind soon enabled him to expose the fallacies of his teacher's reasonings, and to compel him to modify his system. Conscious of his superior abilities he not long after established a school of his own, first at Melun, where the French court then resided, and subsequently at Corbeil, in the neighborhood of Paris. By his excessive application to study his health however became so impaired, that for the purpose of restoring it he was obliged, for the space of two years, to seek the bracing atmosphere of his native village. Upon his return to Paris, William, in great dissatisfaction, left the

field of dialectic controversy to his competitor, and retired to the Abbey of St. Victor. Flattered by his success as a teacher of philosophy, Abelard now sought to add to his reputation as scholar in the sphere of theology, and with that object in view placed himself under the care of William's old preceptor, Anselm of Laon. He was however so little satisfied with his instruction, that he forsook his lectures and devoted himself privately to the study of the Scriptures and the ancient fathers. Nor was it long before he thought himself fully qualified for the office to which he aspired. As a proof of it he undertook for a wager, to explain the difficult prophecy of Ezekiel, which he did with so much dialectic skill as greatly to increase the number of his admirers. It provoked however the jealousy and resentment of Anselm, and he forbade the continuance of his lectures. This obliged Abelard once more to return to Paris, where his fame as a lecturer became so widely known, that young men from all parts of Western Christendom flocked to him that they might receive instruction at his feet.

But it was at this period of his life, that his activity was interrupted by his romantic attachment to a young lady equally accomplished and beautiful. She was the niece of the prebendary Fulbert, in her eighteenth year, when the heart is most susceptible of tender emotions. With her personal charms was blended an air of modesty and grace that rendered her irresistibly attractive. She was, moreover, fond of learning, and was desirous of acquiring a knowledge of its higher branches. Her uncle was disposed to indulge her, but he wished to do it at as little expense as possible. Abelard hearing of it proposed to board in his family and to become the instructor of his beautiful niece. The uncle was pleased with the proposition, and was so imprudent as to resign the pupil entirely to the control of her teacher, even enjoining it upon him to correct her if necessary. Abelard managed to render himself very agreeable to the young lady. Instead of the dull precepts of philosophy he taught her the delightful lessons of love, and succeeded in so insinuating himself into her affections that in the end he was obliged to fly with her to the house of his sister, where she gave birth to a son, whom she named Astrolabius. Heloise was

also of most romantic character. Abelard gained her love by his reputation as a scholar as well as by his talents for music and poetry. When he proposed to restore her honor by giving her his hand in marriage, she refused for the reason that it would interfere with his studies as well as with his clerical ferment. She at length yielded her objections and they were privately married. Heloise, however, regardless of her reputation, persisted in denying it, which so incensed her uncle that to avoid his resentment Abelard sent her to the convent of Argenteuil. Regarding this as a slight upon his niece and a desire to get rid of her, Fulbert became the more enraged and meditated a terrible revenge. The unfortunate man was seized in his chamber at night by hired assassins, who inflicted upon him a cruel and most degrading mutilation. Hearing of this Heloise took the veil in Argenteuil, and Abelard sought admittance to the convent of St. Dennis, where crowds again attended upon his lectures.

Here the persons opposed to him before at Laon, excited by the peculiar views he expressed in his dialectic treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity, were led to prefer charges against him to the Archbishop of Rheims. Arraigned before the synod he relieved himself from many of the charges by an appeal to Augustine. The complaint, however, that the doctrine of the Trinity, as held by the Church, was at variance with his Nominalistic view, was sustained, and he was compelled to cast his *Introductio ad Theologiam* into the fire, to retract the symbol *Quicunque*, and to confine himself to the convent of St. Medard. The proceeding, however, did not meet with general favor, and after some time he was allowed to return to St. Dennis.

Here he brought himself into difficulty by his historical criticisms. He did not suppose that it was Dionysius the Areopagite and disciple of Paul, who was the patron of their monastery. The result was that he was obliged to leave the place. Wearyed at length with perpetual conflicts he determined to seek repose, and having obtained permission from the king he erected a chapel in the neighborhood of Nogent, in the diocese of Troyes, where in the desert he again collected a

crowd of scholars, who to enjoy the benefit of his instruction were willing to submit to the inconveniences of a hermit life. Here he felt himself so comfortable that he dedicated his chapel to the Holy Ghost and called it Paraclete. This again gave offence to his enemies, who regarded it as intended to insinuate the views which he durst not openly avow. In the persecutions which followed they were joined by St. Norbert, the founder of the order of Premontre, and by the still more powerful St. Bernard. The clamor raised against the unfortunate man was so great that many of his friends were carried away by the popular prejudice, and no one ventured to interpose in his favor. He at length made up his mind to seek an asylum in some heathen land, and was only induced to abandon his purpose by his election to the Abbacy of the convent of St. Gildas. In the meantime he had given the management of the Paraclete, with the consent of Innocent II., to Heloise, who with the rest of nuns had been driven from the convent of Argenteuil.

Thus far he wrote his own history, and with the close of the narrative commences his correspondence with Heloise. Beyond this nothing is certain but that he broke off all communication with St. Gildas and opened his school again at Paris. It is probable that his re-appearance at Paris stirred up anew the wrath of his ancient enemy St. Bernard. At all events charges were preferred against him at a Council which was held at Sens in 1140, from the decision of which Abelard appealed to Rome. St. Bernard, however, had anticipated him with the pope, and procured a confirmation of the sentence of the Council, by which he and his pupil Arnold of Brescia were condemned to perpetual confinement. The venerable Peter de Clugny now offered the deeply humbled and sorely afflicted man an asylum, not without some feelings of resentment towards St. Bernard, the Champion of the order of Cistercians. Abelard consented to retract his propositions, yet without actually recanting, and Peter procured his reconciliation with Rome. At Clugny he spent some time in study, in correspondence with Heloise, and in rigid monkish ascetism. That he might obtain a healthier residence Peter recommended him to

the priory of St. Marcellus, near Chalons, where he died on the 21st of April, 1142, in the 63d year of his age. Peter accompanied the funeral to the Paraclete, and Heloise affixed to the corpse the letter of absolution from the hands of his confessor. She survived as the Abbess of the Paraclete two and twenty years (†16th May, 1164), highly esteemed and honored. At her death she was placed in the same tomb with her lover, and afterwards in the same coffin. When the Abbey of the Paraclete was destroyed during the troubles of the Revolution, their remains were preserved, and in 1817 were removed to Paris and interred in the cemetery of Pere La Chaise, where her monument to this day is frequently decorated with the garlands of deceased lovers.

Abelard's intellectual significance is seen, not merely in the submissive adherence of his followers, but also in the strenuous opposition of his adversaries; and if Bernard is to be taken as the representative of the authority and faith of the age, it is the fact also that Abelard represents the principle of free inquiry and rational criticism. His acquirements were by no means extraordinary. He was acquainted with Roman literature, and with Greek so far as it was translated into Latin; but a knowledge of Greek, and especially Hebrew, he had not. Abelard's philosophy consists in dialectics. Of the wide range which science has taken in Physics, Metaphysics and Ethics since the beginning of the 13th century, no traces are found in his writings. It is only within the last 19 years, and through the labors of Cousin, that his views as a dialectician have been clearly ascertained. He was not a Realist. In his first controversy with William of Champeaux he compelled him materially to modify his system. Just as little was he a Nominalist. On the contrary he was decidedly opposed to the doctrine of Roscellin. Abelard's position was intermediate as it regards both systems, to define which the term Conceptualism was employed. He insisted upon the actual significance of ideas in conception, as the human mind was able to form them. They were in his estimation not properly realities, constituting in some supersensuous sphere different from the visible world a world-system of their own. Nor were they, on the other

hand, mere words, empty air ; they were really ideas, inasmuch as the human mind which frames and is occupied with them cannot be satisfied with nullities. Abelard's strength, owing to his fine critical talents, was exhibited rather in his conflict with both extremes than in a clear and well-defined establishment of an intermediate system. The qualified Realism or Nominalism (for the intermediate theory may be designated by either phrase) which Abelard advocated, was the view entertained by Thomas Aquinas, who insisted upon a significance, a certain reality for the general idea as apprehended scientifically, or otherwise science would be occupied with a mere phantasm.

Abelard, as was usual with the scholastics of his day, distinguished between the pre-supposed significance of church faith, and the attempt to prove it in a dialectic way. But his method was not at all the same with that of Anselm of Canterbury, and was decidedly different from the manner in which church authority allows the use of reason. According to Anselm, faith and knowledge are perfectly congruous, so that the results of honest speculation are always in harmony with the belief of the Church, and free inquiry is altogether compatible with submission to its authority. With Abelard the superiority of reason is everywhere indicated, and harmonizes with the faith of the Church more on account of outward considerations than of any inward necessity. He everywhere professes to agree with the Church, quotes freely from the church fathers, and acknowledges the authority of its symbols, even upon points for which there is no warrant in the Scriptures, and yet the faith of the Church is not for him the absolute truth, but a problem for the proof of which speculation was entitled to credit. He by no means intended, in his various discussions of the idea of the Trinity, that the three persons could only be represented thus and no otherwise, but simply, that for the manner in which they are presented to view sufficient arguments can be found. His object, accordingly, was not to establish the faith of the Church, but to confirm the view, and thus silence his opponents. His chief problem was the idea of the Trinity ; but he does not insist upon a specifically Chris-

the priory of St. Marcellus, near Chalons, where he died on the 21st of April, 1142, in the 63d year of his age. Peter accompanied the funeral to the Paraclete, and Heloise affixed to the corpse the letter of absolution from the hands of his confessor. She survived as the Abbess of the Paraclete two and twenty years (†16th May, 1164), highly esteemed and honored. At her death she was placed in the same tomb with her lover, and afterwards in the same coffin. When the Abbey of the Paraclete was destroyed during the troubles of the Revolution, their remains were preserved, and in 1817 were removed to Paris and interred in the cemetery of Pere La Chaise, where her monument to this day is frequently decorated with the garlands of deceased lovers.

Abelard's intellectual significance is seen, not merely in the submissive adherence of his followers, but also in the strenuous opposition of his adversaries; and if Bernard is to be taken as the representative of the authority and faith of the age, it is the fact also that Abelard represents the principle of free inquiry and rational criticism. His acquirements were by no means extraordinary. He was acquainted with Roman literature, and with Greek so far as it was translated into Latin; but a knowledge of Greek, and especially Hebrew, he had not. Abelard's philosophy consists in dialectics. Of the wide range which science has taken in Physics, Metaphysics and Ethics since the beginning of the 18th century, no traces are found in his writings. It is only within the last 19 years, and through the labors of Cousin, that his views as a dialectician have been clearly ascertained. He was not a Realist. In his first controversy with William of Champeaux he compelled him materially to modify his system. Just as little was he a Nominalist. On the contrary he was decidedly opposed to the doctrine of Roscellin. Abelard's position was intermediate as it regards both systems, to define which the term Conceptualism was employed. He insisted upon the actual significance of ideas in conception, as the human mind was able to form them. They were in his estimation not properly realities, constituting in some supersensuous sphere different from the visible world a world-system of their own. Nor were they, on the other

hand, mere words, empty air ; they were really ideas, inasmuch as the human mind which frames and is occupied with them cannot be satisfied with nullities. Abelard's strength, owing to his fine critical talents, was exhibited rather in his conflict with both extremes than in a clear and well-defined establishment of an intermediate system. The qualified Realism or Nominalism (for the intermediate theory may be designated by either phrase) which Abelard advocated, was the view entertained by Thomas Aquinas, who insisted upon a significance, a certain reality for the general idea as apprehended scientifically, or otherwise science would be occupied with a mere phantasm.

Abelard, as was usual with the scholastics of his day, distinguished between the pre-supposed significance of church faith, and the attempt to prove it in a dialectic way. But his method was not at all the same with that of Anselm of Canterbury, and was decidedly different from the manner in which church authority allows the use of reason. According to Anselm, faith and knowledge are perfectly congruous, so that the results of honest speculation are always in harmony with the belief of the Church, and free inquiry is altogether compatible with submission to its authority. With Abelard the superiority of reason is everywhere indicated, and harmonizes with the faith of the Church more on account of outward considerations than of any inward necessity. He everywhere professes to agree with the Church, quotes freely from the church fathers, and acknowledges the authority of its symbols, even upon points for which there is no warrant in the Scriptures, and yet the faith of the Church is not for him the absolute truth, but a problem for the proof of which speculation was entitled to credit. He by no means intended, in his various discussions of the idea of the Trinity, that the three persons could only be represented thus and no otherwise, but simply, that for the manner in which they are presented to view sufficient arguments can be found. His object, accordingly, was not to establish the faith of the Church, but to confirm the view, and thus silence his opponents. His chief problem was the idea of the Trinity ; but he does not insist upon a specifically Chris-

tian idea, partaking of the character of revelation, but endeavors to show by analogies that it was possible and within the range of our thoughts. How little his whole conception partook of an exclusively Christian character appears from his attempt to show that Plato and the heathen sages had not simply intimations, but a pretty full knowledge of the Christian dogma.

Abelard's dialectic method consisted chiefly in seizing hold of the objectionable side of a dogma, encumbered with all possible difficulties, and then solving them in such a way as to indicate that the language in which the question was expressed would admit of a double sense; as for instance, in the idea of necessity in the union of the divine foreknowledge with human freedom, and in that of volition, in the question whether all comes to pass that God wills. The whole system of dogmatics is brought out in his treatment of the divine attributes. The incarnation of the Son is treated under the head of omnipotence in the question whether it is still possible for God to become man; the two natures of Christ under that of immutability, and his appearance in the flesh under that of omnipresence, according to which God is always everywhere present.

Abelard established no school of his own, if we are to understand by it an exclusive circle of followers, who received and perpetuated his doctrines. In order to this, his investigations were too critical, the results too little positive, and the opposition of the church authorities too violent. But the influence of his keen rationalizing spirit was powerfully felt around him, as the attachment of his followers under the most adverse circumstances fully shows. The later scholastics borrowed much from him as to outward form; for instance, the array against each other of the authorities of the ancient classics and those of Christian times, in imitation of his *sic et non*; and also the arrangement of the dogmatic matter in "Lombard's Sentences," which appeared soon after his day. On the other hand, keen Rationalism in the discussion of dogmas became speechless before the powerful strides of church authority. Then came the time of the Sententiarii and the Summists, when the dogmatic material was most extensively worked up. But even

if criticism made a decision between the *videtur quod sic* and the *videtur quod non*, it durst not make it with the bold self-reliance of an Abelard.

Charles Remusat's *Abelard*, *Paris*, 1845, 2 vols., is quite comprehensive and full, and attempts an analysis both of his philosophical and theological systems. It is to be regretted that he was not more thoroughly versed in dogmatic studies. He was ignorant of the connexion between Abelard's theory of the Trinity and that of Augustine, and also passed an erroneous judgment upon the merits of Scholasticism as it was advocated after the time of Abelard by Lombard and some of his disciples.

RETTBERG.—*Dr. Wolff.*

ABRAHAM.

ABRAHAM, son of Terah, and 10th in lineal descent from Shem, was a native of Ur Chasdim. About the date of his birth there has been much dispute. Gen. 11 : 26 says, that after Terah's 70th year he begat three sons, of whom Abraham (though probably the youngest, Gen. 20 : 12) is named first, because the Mosaic chronology follows the line of promise. In Gen. 11 : 32 we are told that Terah died at the age of 205 years; and in Gen. 12 : 1 that Abraham was summoned by the Lord to leave his kindred and country in his 75th year, consequently 60 years before his father's death. Thus his birth would occur according to the Hebrew text, A. M., 1946, or 290 years after the flood. But in Acts 7 : 4 Stephen says that Abraham left Ur *after* his father's death. This seeming discrepancy, however, will disappear, upon the reasonable presumption that Stephen conformed to a common notion of the Jews, who, unwilling to suppose Abraham guilty of a violation of the principle laid down in the 4th commandment, regarded Terah as having *died spiritually* upon his relapse into idolatry, which happened during Abraham's earlier years.*

* This is the most natural of the several proposed solutions of the difficulty. The explanation based upon the supposition that Abraham was the son of a subsequent wife, and not born until Terah was 130 years old, cannot be reconciled with Gen. 11 : 26, which plainly means to indicate the time when, or about which, the three sons named were born. Moreover, such accommodations, in reference to the accidents of the subject treated, are of frequent occurrence. (See *Art Accommodation*.)

Although the original abode of the family of Terah was Ur Chasdim, they had removed at the time Abraham is brought specially into notice, to Haran in Mesopotamia. It was there Abraham was called of God, and from thence in obedience to that call that he went forth in faith, with his wife Sarah, and Lot the son of his brother Haran, to the land of Canaan. In order rightly to understand the *purposes of Providence* in His guidance of Abraham, we must briefly review the *history of the kingdom of God on earth* to the period of Abraham's call. The first great promise given after the fall of man (Gen. 3 : 15,) opened the prospect of the ultimate triumph of the human race over the principle and power of sin, and summoned the entire race to battle with the great deceiver. But no full response was given to this solemn call. On the contrary, the sinful propensities of the race became so fearfully predominant (Gen. 6,) that a general judgment by the flood was called for, to prepare the world for commencing its history anew. The execution of that judgment took effect, however, with a wise reference to the historical continuity of the race, whilst there yet remained *one family* which was not wholly spoiled by abounding corruptions, and which God might preserve as the channel through whose posterity the promised redemption of mankind might ultimately come (1 Peter 3 : 18, 21.) But the depravity of the old race soon developed itself in the progeny of the new, though in a modified form, viz : in that of *Heathenism*, the hour of whose nativity is indicated by the haughty declaration of the builders of Babel (Gen. 11 : 4.) Abandoning God, and contemning *His future salvation*, they hoped by their own power and wisdom to procure a more satisfactory *present salvation*. A second judgment, therefore, was required, and it was executed in the confusion of tongues and scattering of the people. There was no extermination of the race in this case, because Heathenism, though an ungodly development, was still purely human in its character, and therefore retained the capability of restoration to God, and possessed germs whose productions (in art, science, and civilization) could and should be made subservient to the kingdom of God. But the separation of mankind was necessary to break the force of

the gigantic audacity and pride of this primæval communism. Thenceforth God left the scattered tribes to their own ways (Acts 14 : 16,) that time might show how much or little human power and wisdom could effect, and that mankind might be reconciled at length to the purposes and plans of their Creator (Luke 15 : 11-32.) The attractions of youthful heathenism, however, soon proved too powerful even for the piety of the Shemite branch of Noah's posterity, and Terah, Abraham's father, appears as an idolater (Josh. 24 : 2; Judith 5 : 6, 7.) It was time once more for God to interfere, and for the third time open a new way for the scheme of Redemption. This was done by the *choice* and *call* of *Abraham* (Gen. 12 : 1-3.) This call included a command and a promise ; the *command* was, that he should separate from his kindred and father's house, and yield with unquestioning faith to the guidance of God ; the *promise* was, that he should be the father of a numerous and richly blessed posterity. But *Abraham* being childless and his wife barren, the fulfilment of the promise became *physically* impossible, so that the series of events which started in him, progressed by means of miracles and intervening grace on the part of God, and the exercise of faith, obedience and hope on the part of *Abraham*. At first the transaction involved only a single individual, but immediately announced a scheme of universal application :—“In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.” This must not be understood, however, as a definite allusion to a personal, individual Messiah or Saviour (any more than Gen. 3 : 15, or 9 ; 26,) for “*Abraham's seed*” designates the totality of his posterity. Neither can Hengstenberg's assumption be allowed (Christol. I., 57, upon Gen. 18 : 17, and John 8 : 56,) that some clearer revelations upon this subject, of which we have no record, were granted to the Patriarch. Christ (John 8 : 56) spake of *Abraham's expectation*, realized by his faith (Heb. 11 : 1,) in the light of N. T. fulfilment. All the hopes of the Patriarchs touching the promised salvation were then yet limited to their national development, and it was only after this cherished expectation had been realized, and *one man* appeared as the Saviour and Deliverer of His people, that the prophecy began

more definitely to point to a *personal* Messiah. This occurred first in the case of Moses (Deut. 18: 18, etc.,) still more clearly with David and Solomon (2 Sam. 7: 12-16.)—Abraham obeyed the Divine call. Halting near Sichem in the plain of Moreh (Gen. 12: 6,) Jehovah appeared to him declaring: “This land will I give unto thy seed;” and Abraham marked the place by erecting an altar and worshipping the Lord. But soon a famine prevailed in the land, and Abraham, *without awaiting Divine direction*, went down to *Egypt*, the granary of the old world. There peril far worse than famine overtook him; for he had lost his wife, the appointed mother of the promised seed (see *Sarah*,) but for the timely interference of the Lord, whose faithfulness corrected the errors into which Abraham’s lack of faith had led him, viz: his flight from the promised land, and dissimulation before Pharaoh. It is worthy of special notice that this incident occurred in Egypt, the subsequent scene of the afflictions of Abraham’s posterity. Enriched by the gifts of Pharaoh, Abraham again returned to Palestine, and settled near Hebron, in the plain of Mamre, together with his nephew Lot. But as the possessions of both rapidly increased, and inconveniences arose from their proximity to each other, Lot (see Art. *Lot*) voluntarily left Abraham, and chose for his abode the fertile and well-watered vale of Siddim. Abraham, however, was soon required to follow him thither, to rescue him from the grasp of Chedorlaomer (Gen. 14: 1-16.) On his return from that martial excursion Abraham was met by *Melchisedek* (see Art.) priest of the Most High God (Gen. 14: 18,) and king of *Salem*, from whom he received bread and wine, and the sacerdotal blessing and sanction of his mission, as the Deliverer of the land, whilst he gave Melchisedek the tithes of all the spoils which he had taken from the vanquished king, in recognition of his priesthood. Melchisedek held in possession what Abraham had only in promise, land and people, royalty and priesthood, and was thus a type of that which Abraham’s seed should realize, but which, when realized (as in Aaron, David, above all in Christ,) should be infinitely more glorious. But it was the will of God that the history of Abraham and his seed should be developed upon

the basis of a divine covenant. *The first step in this covenant* was taken when Abraham's faith in Jehovah's promise gave such proof of its strength, that it was accounted to him for righteousness (Gen. 15 : 6,) and that covenant was ratified by a sacrifice. The two halves of the sacrifice represented the two parties about to be united in the covenant. Abraham succeeded in driving away the ravenous fowls which seized upon the carcasses of the sacrifice, and after watching until sundown, fell into a trance, in which the import of the threatening omen was revealed to him (Gen. 15 : 18-17,) and he saw a smoking and fiery pillar pass through the midst of the divided sacrifice. It was the symbol of Jehovah's holiness (Ex. 3 : 2 ; 13 : 21,) the divine Shekinah. The covenant was closed, and God solemnly assumed the performance of His part of it, though this as yet was not required of Abraham. He only knew that of his body the promised seed should come (15 : 4.) Sarah, who thus far had not been named in the covenant, would not believe that at her age she could become a mother, and sought participation in the covenant by means of her handmaid, *Hagar*, (see *Hagar*,) by whom Abraham begat *Ishmael* (see *Ishmael*.) It soon, however, became manifest that Sarah's thoughts were not God's thoughts. Thus 13 years passed away, and Sarah's barrenness became more fully confirmed (Gen. 18 : 11,) when, at length, the period of the fulfilment of the first item in the promise arrived, not in the course of nature, but by the wonder-working power of grace. Then came the second stadium of the fulfilling covenant, the *circumcision* (see Art.) of Abraham and his household, in which he assumes his part of its conditions, and receives sanctified power to beget the promised son. Thus Abraham, and Sarah with him, entered upon a new epoch in their life, and thenceforth received new names. (*ABRAM*=*high father*) shall be called (*ABRAHAM*=father of a multitude,) and (*SARAI*=princess) (*SARAH*=the fruitful one.) Soon after this, whilst Abraham was sitting at the door of his tent in Mamre, *three men* drew near, celestial messengers, whom he at once recognized and reverently approached as the representatives of *Jehovah* (Gen. 18 : 3-15.) The visit, however, did not concern him as much as his wife, whose dead

womb should now receive new power of conception upon condition of her implicit faith. At first she doubted, but the holy messengers put her unbelief to shame, and inspired confidence into her doubting heart. When they arose to depart Abraham accompanied them, and on the way was informed of another object of their mission, the destruction of the corrupt cities of the vale of Siddim, a purpose which God, as his covenant friend, would not conceal from him (Gen. 18: 17.) Moved not merely by a noble humanity, or sympathizing regard for Lot, but rather by a lofty sense of his office as intercessor for the nations of the earth, the friend of God pressed his intercessions for the doomed cities. The smoking ruins of Sodom, or possibly his nomadic interests, induced Abraham to leave Hebron, and move further southward, along the lowlands of the sea, and within the dominion of the Philistine king Abimelech. There the Lord delivered him from the same danger that threatened him in Egypt, and revealed to the king Abraham's prophetic and priestly character (Gen. 20: 7.) Abraham and Abimelech confirmed their mutual regard by a covenant (Gen. 21: 22-32,) and the place was called Beer-sheba (well of the covenant.) Meanwhile, 25 years passed since the promise was first given ; Abraham had reached his 100th, and Sarah her 90th year. At length the hour in which their anxious desires should be realized arrived, and Sarah brought forth *Isaac*. Upon the festival occasion of the weaning of the child, the rude and scornful temper of Ishmael (then in his 16th year) showed itself so offensively, that Sarah requested the dismissal of Hagar and her son, and (by the counsel of the Lord, Gen. 21: 12,) succeeded in her effort. Though it grieved the paternal heart of Abraham to part with Ishmael, he yielded obedience, and found the painfulness of the duty alleviated by the Divine assurance that Hagar's son should also be blessed, and become a great nation. This new act of self-denial prepared the patriarch to rise to that exalted faith, which should qualify him for the still severer trial which awaited him, the offering up in sacrifice of his only son, the son of his love, upon *Moriah*.

The divine command (Gen. 22: 2) distinctly directed Abra-

ham to take the son of the promise and offer him slain as a burnt-offering unto the Lord. It is wholly unjustifiable to explain this command, as some have recently attempted to do, as having required nothing more than a spiritual dedication of the child to God, and as having been misapprehended by Abraham. The language is explicit, and was unquestionably designed to impress Abraham as it did; though it is equally clear that the purpose of the Lord was simply to "tempt" Abraham, and prove his hearty readiness to obey God, even when He required what was most difficult and incomprehensible. The subsequent prevention of the fatal stroke shows this. It was necessary, however, to require of Abraham the outward act, that he might give proof of the full and unreserved surrender of his heart in faith and obedience to God, and in order that all *reservatio mentalis*, all conference with flesh and blood, all self-deception, might be wholly excluded. It is true that fanatics grossly misinterpret and misapply this passage; but the Christian expositor must not let himself be tempted by their folly to deny its real import. The issue of this incident is a sufficient rebuke to such fanaticism. Even though human sacrifices were not condemned by the Mosaic Law, as an abomination before God, the event itself declares this distinctly enough. For since the angel of the Lord withheld the uplifted hand of Abraham from slaying his son, it must be manifest to every sane reader of this narrative, that before God the true and acceptable sacrifice is the devotion of heart and soul in unreserved surrender to Him, and that whatever exceeds this is a displeasing abomination in His sight. And it is precisely in this revealed difference between what is true and false in man's offerings to the Lord, that we find the deep significance of the entire transaction for Abraham's posterity. It exhibits the victory of the light of revelation and the divinely inspired hope of redemption, over the clouded consciousness of heathenism. It is a divine rejection, once for all times, of human sacrifices. Thus at the commencement of its history, the Jewish nation broke through the barriers of pagan superstitions, and left their cruel errors in the rear. Those, indeed, who see in the immolation of human beings only the

densest darkness of paganism, who can discover in those revolting sacrifices nothing but evidences of the grossest degradation and barbarism, and cannot admit that any deep and earnest truth (though in a fearfully distorted form) lies at their root, must also fail to discern in the narrative before us its solemn and significant allusions to man's deepest wants. The truth involved in human sacrifices is found in our consciousness of the inadequacy of the sacrifice of beasts to atone for the sins of men, and the desire to lay a more costly offering upon the altar ; the *perversion* of that truth by which sinful self-deception is occasioned consists in this, that human life is not thus sanctified, but destroyed ; that no true propitiation is thereby offered to Deity, inasmuch as the being sacrificed is himself unholy ; and finally, that the sacrifice cannot be vicarious, because it is usually constrained. The sacrificial homicide of heathenism is a shriek of despair, the harsh discords of which are first harmonized in the ONE great sacrifice of Calvary, and there elevated to a jubilee of redeemed humanity. The command, therefore, to offer up Isaac has important bearings upon the human sacrifices of paganism, with reference to which it must be considered in order to our proper apprehension of it. Abraham saw in those sacrifices, which appear to have been more frequent among the Canaanites than other surrounding nations, and the smoke of which arose from every adjacent hill-top, how cheerfully parents offered their children to propitiate their deities. If there was any truth in such painful and bloody consecrations, it became Abraham, as the chosen representative of the true religion, to recognise and conform to it; but on the other hand, it was meet that he should exemplify God's abhorrence of the evil it involved. The former was accomplished by his obedience to the command of God; the latter by the divine interposition in the case. Furthermore, the example of the heathen rendered it desirable to test Abraham's willingness to do as much for his God, if required, as they did for their idols. And this trial became the more necessary if ever the matter had presented itself in this form to his own heart ; for his entire life, internal and external, was to be one of self-denial and surrender to the Lord. This,

therefore, is also a reason for the divine command, though not the only one. The generation of Isaac was rendered possible by a divine miracle, but still was effected within the usual course of nature, which was indeed symbolically (by circumcision) purified, but not wholly released from the carnality and impurity of the flesh. Isaac, consequently, though the son of promise and grace, still bore the stain of natural generation, which it was necessary to renounce. And here we find the symbolical import of the transaction. What circumcision was for the father, this offering should be for the son,—*that the symbol of consecration to the begetting of the child promised, this the symbol of the consecration of the child begotten for the promise.* The transaction had, moreover, a *subjective* significance for Abraham. His love for Isaac needed purification and sanctification. Having begotten him in the flesh (though by divine intervention,) his love was still carnal. The perfection of his faith, however, requires the crucifixion of all mere earthly love for his son, as at the first it required the forsaking of father and mother, kindred and friends. This done, he receives the beloved sacrifice anew from the hands of God, which thus becomes entirely a gift of grace. As the circumcision of Abraham was to be repeated in every subsequent member of the covenant, so too the offering up of Isaac. But as in this case the sacrifice required was ideal and not actual, so it thenceforth suffices for his posterity, and the presentation of the first-born in the temple became its substituted symbol. Still another thought is suggested. Although Abraham was exhausted by age, he believed God when he promised that his seed should be as the stars in number. Will he hold fast to this promise in spite of the knife? He did (Gen. 22: 56;) for he believed that the Lord who quickened Sarah's barren womb, could also raise up Isaac from the dead (Heb. 11: 19.) Yet this victory of faith was not easy for him; for instead of being permitted to execute the command upon the spot, he was required to make a three day's journey, during which faith and fear might contend with each other in his heart, that the victory might be more complete. We have already considered the import of God's timely intervention, in its reference to human sacrifices,

and it only remains to notice the substitution of the ram. The perplexity into which the covenant-people of God might fall, with regard to suitable propitiatory sacrifices, was relieved by this miraculous provision ; the Lord Himself legitimizing the substitution of a beast, and by the selection of Moriah for the execution of the sacrifice; consecrating the spot upon which the future services of their Temple should be performed. *With* this victory of faith, by this steadfastness in his vocation, Abraham reached the crowning point in his history, and thenceforth he passed his days in peace and quietness, without being subjected to new tests, enduring other conflicts, or gaining additional victories, until "full of years," he was gathered unto his fathers. The sacred narrative, however, reports one additional act, illustrative of his faith : the prophetic purchase of the cave of Machpelah (see Art.) near Hebron, as a burying-place. He would have his bones, with those of his beloved Sarah, repose in the midst of the land which his distant posterity should inherit, as an abiding memento and assurance, during their painful sojourn for 400 years in a strange country, that that land should once be theirs. After Sarah's death Abraham married Keturah, who bare him six sons, the ancestors of as many Arabic nations. Having richly endowed these and Ishmael, out of his vast possessions, and made Isaac heir of the residue, Abraham died at the age of 175 years, and was buried by Isaac and Ishmael, by the side of Sarah, in the cave of Machpelah. Mohammedans, Jews, and Christians, vie with each other in their praises of Abraham. His natural descendants are innumerable. Other nations have arisen and vanished, but the posterity of Abraham have continued through all ages, unmixed and unchanged. And their mission is not yet completed. They still enjoy the blessing of Abraham's seed, and remain unconsumed amid the wars of nations and the changes of the times. But that which most distinguished Abraham was, not his humano-national, but his *spiritual* character. Wherever this has descended to his posterity, or communicated itself to other people, there are his true children (Gal. 3: 7, 29; Rom. 9: 6-8.) And if we would rightly apprehend his relation to the history of the world, or that of re-

demption, we must regard him as the *father of the faithful*. For countless as the stars of heaven, and bright as they, are his spiritual children. His faith, which was reckoned unto him for righteousness, is the prototype of Christian faith. His life, although it anticipated a development of 2000 years, exhibited what would form the substance and beauty of the Christian character (Rom. 4.) The title applied to him by James (2: 23,) "the friend of God," is familiar among the Eastern Mohammedans to this day (*Khalil-Allah*, or simply *el-Khalil*) Rabbinnical tradition ascribes to him the invention of the alphabet, as well as superior skill in Astronomy, Astrology, Philosophy, and Chemistry, and supplies the lack of the marvellous in the Bible narrative with many fabulous legends (see *Othonis lex.* Rabbin, p. 2; *Eisenmenger* entd. Jud. I., 490, etc.) Allusions to him are also found in Grecian traditions. According to N. Damascenus, Abraham came from Chaldea with a vast company, and founded the kingdom of Damascus (Joseph. Ant. I., 7, § 2.) Justin (36, 2, 3) makes him the 4th king of Damascus. (Com. *Herbelot*, biblioth. orient. art. *Abraham*; and Hottinger, Hist. Orient. p. 50.)

The genealogical relations of the history of Abraham have of late been understood by some only ethnographically, as by *Ewald* (Gesch. d. Volkes, Dr.) and *Bertheau* (Zur Gesch. d. Israel.) According to the latter, Abraham was the leader of vast hordes who migrated from the mountainous districts of Chaldea towards the south-west; in support of which view Bertheau refers to Gen. 14, and the above-cited Greek traditions.

KURTZ (OF DORPAT.)*

ADAM.

ADAM and his Sons.—The name (ADAM LXX, *'Adāμ*, Lat. *Adamus*, Adam, Adae) is mostly erroneously derived from ADAMAH=earth, the more simple form deduced from the more complex; or more correctly, as far as the form of the word is concerned, from DAM=blood, and ADAM=to be red, with reference to the beauty of the bright roseate skin of the first pair in contrast with an original dark race (Joseph. Antiq. 2, I; *Targum Jonathan* on Gen. 2: 7; *Leusden*, Onomasticum

sacr. s. v. *Adam*; *Marck*, hist. paradisi, 2, 5; *Gesenius Lexicon*.) Sir W. Jones suggests the Sanscrit *Adim*=first! It seems far more natural and correct to derive it from the old verb **ADAM**=to render compact, to establish, whence also **ADAMAH**=prince. He is the *First-man* ($\pi\rho\alpha\tau\omega\tau\sigma\tau\omega\zeta$, $\pi\rho\alpha\tau\omega\tau\lambda\alpha\tau\omega\zeta$) created on the sixth day, after all the other works of creation had been brought forth (Gen. 1: 26-31.) His creation is not mentioned as the others are named, as the result simply of the divine *word*, but as following a special deliberation, "let us make man," and designed for a more exalted purpose, viz. to bear and reveal the image of God. Furthermore man is represented as the proximate *end* for which God created the other five days' (Epochs?) works, which present a regular gradation, finding in *man* their unity and consummation, so that creation is objectively comprehended in him. On the other hand man is the eye and the selfconsciousness of creation, in so far as the entire corporeal world besides furnishes only a onesided representation of that which is completed in his organized personality. For man possesses, in higher potency, all the powers and kingdoms of nature in himself, as subservient to his personality. And finally, the apprehension of creation as a divine revelation (a view of the subject which is coeval with man and certainly older than primeval poetry (*Herder*), and also perfectly consistent with the reality of what occurred, as well as with unprejudiced reason,) is based upon man's original, clear and sincere contemplation of himself and the rest of God's works around him. Thus man (in respect of consciousness) may be regarded as subjectively comprehending creation in himself. The formation of man's body, out of the earth (OFAR MINHOAIDAMAH,) and the breathing in of the breath of life (NISHMAS HAJM,) as well as the successive creation of man and woman, are described in the second chapter of the divine record (Gen. 2: 4, &c.,) characterized by the use of the name *Jehovah*. Traces of this record are found in many old traditions, which evidently proceed from a confused knowledge of the conflict occasioned by the fall in the soul of man, and are modified by a predominant conception of that peculiar constitution of man which was given to him with

reference to that sad event. Anthropology must find its proper basis in this record. Man, in his entire being, is *the image of God*. This doubtless was originally referred to the sensible manifestations of deity, inasmuch as in that theophanic epoch God always appeared in human form. But even that view involved the conscious distinction between the external and internal, soul and body, or as still more profoundly conceived, body, soul and spirit; for man first became a living soul after the inbreathing of the spirit (Gen. 2: 7.) This *image of God* consists substantially in a *personality related to the Divine*. Baumgarten's distinction between the two inner potencies is erroneous: *soul= substance, spirit=activity*, (*Grundzüge d. bibl. Theol.* 322;) for the reverse use of the terms occurs in the O. T., where the *soul* is spoken of as the acting or suffering agent. Stirm also mistakes the true distinction (*bibl.-anthrop. Untersuchungen*, *Tübinger Zeits. für Theol.* 1834, No. 3, p. 26;) likewise J. N. Crusius and Delitzsch (*bibl. prophet. Theol.* § 1887,) *soul=spirit* as connected with matter; and Beck (*bibl. Sittenlehre*, § 16, &c.) in treating them as expressing a distinction of substances instead of potencies. Hoffman, however, discusses the subject with great ability (*Weissagung u. Erfüllung im A. u. N. T.*, I. 18,) only he errs in regarding the spirit, because breathed in, as not belonging essentially and permanently to the personality of man. The correct view is this: the *spirit* is the innermost principle of man's personality in its consciousness of being a creature of God and therefore related to Him; the *soul* is the principle of individuality, rendered a human individuality by its relation to the spirit, and consequently the principle on which the support and development of man's corporeal life depends (*vis animalis*.)

A disregard of these anthropological principles has occasioned the prevalent misapprehension of the import of the "*Image of God*" (see Article.) Earlier expositors endeavored to solve the difficulty by distinguishing between ZELIM (*εἰκὼν*, *imago*) and DEMUS (*οὐρανος*, *similitudo*), the former as expressing a *physical, created*, the latter a *moral and acquired* resemblance (*Clemens Alex., Origen.*) or the one bodily, the other intellec-

tual (*Augustine.*) The scholastics referred the *image* to the soul, the *likeness* to the body as the expression of the soul (image of the image.) Modern writers speak indefinitely of a prevailing popular opinion which is supposed to be set forth, by way of accommodation, in this doctrine (*Baumgarten-Crusius* 321,) or were content with finding the "image" in man's dominion over brutes and the comparative nobler form of his body (*Colln*, bibl. Theol. I., 222,) or even in his erect posture (*Herder, Gabler*;) or they found some traces of the system of emanations (*de Wette*, bibl. Theol. §114;) or left the matter in doubt and darkness (*Lutz*, bibl. Dogmatik, 69, &c.) *Steudel* is the first to enter a better path (bibl. Theol. d. A. T. 84.) *Havernik* falls back upon the explanations of the Fathers (bibl. Theol. d. A. T. 56, &c.) In Genesis, however, the *image* is expressly stated as that which *qualified* Adam for exercising dominion over other creatures (1: 26, 28;) and the second narrative (Gen, 2: 7) further explains this by stating the origin of man's *personality*, and speaks (Gen. 2: 15) of the complete control given to man over the creature as his proper destiny, of his intellectual and self-conscious reflections (Gen. 2: 19, 20) upon surrounding creation by which he becomes sensible of his loneliness, and which is still further developed upon the creation of the woman (v. 23.) *Personality*, therefore, is the *image of God* in Adam. Adam, as *dust*, (OSAT) is in affinity with other creatures of the earth; as a *spirit* (NE-SHOMAH) he is related to God, and constituted a mediator between God and the creature. His godlike life should be developed according to the law of personality, in freedom of the will. This divine life should become a divine-human life, and as such control itself and impress itself upon entire creation, so that the whole earth might reflect the image of God and be a manifest expression of His will. And this actually occurred in man's *primeval state*. He was perfectly happy. The traditional longings of all nations after that state show that the remembrance of it still lingered in the human heart. Primeval man lived in unclouded union with nature, which was created for him, as he had been for the enjoyment of it. Labor (Gen. 1: 15) was not an exhausting toil (Gen. 3: 17, 19.) His life vigorous and secure, cheerful and bright.

His dominion over creation was natural, unresisted, divinely blessed (Gen. 1: 27;) so that God himself first excites in Adam (Gen. 2: 18, 20) a sense of loneliness, in order to gratify it in a more exalted sphere of being. His self-consciousness found full satisfaction in itself as comprehending the consciousness of God, who was thus ever present to him, and whom he revered with the simplicity and fervor of filial regard (Gen. 1: 27; 2: 6, 15, 18.) Even the distinction between finite and infinite was unknown to him, as well as the diversity of his various moral relations to God. But this state of *innocence*, of simple natural rectitude, is to be clearly distinguished from that *righteousness* which is obtained by struggling faith, and most especially from that *holiness* which is, through grace, the final result of our spiritual conflicts. Adam lived in ignorance of evil, learned its possibility indeed from the prohibition, but not its reality. He lived in like happy ignorance of the fruits of sin. The kingdom of *death* was unknown to him, its sense of guilt, fear, the power of evil, pain, physical derangement. Physiological development did not yet involve suffering and pain ; it merely promoted the pleasant sense of life, and labor was the playful exercise of its powers. Primeval man is not said to be exempt from bodily death ; its possibility is spoken of as something distant (3: 22,) and hence its mortality is assumed. But as physical death had not yet become the penal consequence of sin (Gen. 2: 17; 3: 19,) his dying would have been painless transition to a higher life. In exercising his *intelligence* man was confined to the contemplation of himself and the world around him, but always in the light of his consciousness and love of God. His knowledge, therefore, must have been infallible, though at first childish, in opposition to the theory of the higher culture of the primeval race, which is maintained by the school of Schelling, in the doctrine of the degeneracy of man from a more exalted state. Equally erroneous is the theory which assumes a low brutish condition as the primeval state of man (*Buffon, Voltaire, &c.*) The original destiny of Adam, in a natural view, was the development of the human race (Gen. 1: 28.) Sexuality and procreation, therefore, are not the results of sin ; neither do they constitute

the original sin of Adam and Eve (as the Mystics hold;) much less tenable is the Jewish-Platonic conceit that Adam was primitively a man-woman (*Androgynie, Maimonides More Nebhochim* 2, 30; *Marck hist. Parad.* 2, 2, 12; *Plato's Sympos.*,) which the scriptural record distinctly contradicts. It was, furthermore, his destiny to exercise dominion over other creatures, and develop to its highest perfection the image of God in him. The opinions concerning the gigantic size of Adam, advocated by Philo, Augustine, the Talmudists and Mohammedans, are fabulous (*Eisenmeyer entdeck. Judenth.* I. 84, 365, 830; II. 417; *Othon. lexic. rabb.* p. 9, &c.; *Hottinger hist. or.* 22; *Herbelot biblioth. or.* I. 90, &c.; *Epiphan. haer.* 46, 2, &c.; *Augustin civ. D.* 14, 17; *Cedren. hist.* p. 6, 9. **Winer.*) *Neo-platonists* and *Gnostics*, supposing that the distinction between flesh and spirit was synonymous with that between body and soul, matter and spirit, introduced a false anthropology into the Church, which culminated in the Manichean theory, according to which sin is made necessary to the process of natural development and Adam is simply the original type of that necessity. *Pelagians* confound Adam's innocence with righteousness, as favoring their view of a condition of moral indifference, which was neither good nor evil. The *semipelagianism* of the middle ages maintained no decided view upon the subject. *Socinians* reject the idea of Adam's original righteousness, because they hold that righteousness must be acquired by the free act of man. The evangelical doctrine of the Reformation, on the contrary, rightly apprehended *righteousness as a divinely wrought rectitude*. *Arminians*, unwilling to adopt this view, were content with an indefinite notion of an original state of childhood. *Rationalists* assume that Adam was just what man is now. *Supernaturalists* in this, as in all other doctrines, adopted the teachings of revelation, and acknowledged the fall of man, only advocating the theory of a rapid original development of the powers and faculties of Adam. *Hegelianism* holds that Adam's innocence was purely negative, as that of children. Even *Schleiermacher* assumes the presence of a minimum of sin in Adam, by confounding *germ* with *possibility*, and taking a quantitative view of the subject.

The Bible further represents Adam as having been *tempted* by God (Gen. 2: 16,) so that by a free personal act he might choose the good, and take God as his portion. His character should be voluntarily formed upon the basis of his constitution as a creature, and thus his dominion over creation be developed. The temptation to prefer the good, however, instead of more effectually excluding the evil, was allowed to open the way of access to his heart for the adversary (3: 1) in the form of a serpent. The speech of the serpent fell like an enchantment upon man, who had hitherto never heard words used but as the vehicle of truth. The process of the temptation and deception is presented in a strictly psychological way. It starts with what God really said to Adam, omitting the statement of the moral motives involved in the case. The woman's answer ignores the most important characteristics of the tree (2: 17—"tree of the knowledge of good and evil,") and forthwith the barriers of selfish gratification, of power and knowledge, vanish, and the boundless prospect of existence without obedience bursts open to the view of tempted man. For a while he gazes at the picture, which was in reality only a grossly selfish distortion of his true destiny, but which led step by step into disbelief of the kind purpose of God in his creation, into selfishness, into an usurpation of God's power, and finally into self-deification. Thus *lust* was engendered, then *DESIRE*, then came forth the fatal ACT=SIN (3: 6.) The *woman* was first assailed on account, doubtless, of her more active fancy and sensitive susceptibility. Thus *death* fastened upon the life of man, not as a sudden consummation, but as a process. Man began to die from that moment, and the high age reached by the primeval race made the operation of the law of death all the more painful. Pure happiness was lost (Gen. 8: 7-24,) first in their consciousness of guilt (v. 7,) then in their exposure before God (v. 10, &c.) The returning sense of God's presence pierced their soul with anguish (v. 7;) their intercourse with nature became a toilsome struggle (v. 16-19,) and even a perilous conflict (v. 15.) Man had chosen a false method of fulfilling his destiny (by the knowledge of good and evil,) and now *evil* should not be something merely possible for him, an unknown vanquished power, but his own act, and

a real and fearful tyrant over him. His entire relation to God, to the world, to himself was changed. He felt himself inwardly sundered from God, hence his expulsion (3 : 22-24.) Now God appeared as the avenger (v. 24;) nay man was at war with himself, and would gladly conceal his hated nakedness from his own view (3 : 10.) Formally he should indeed fulfil his destiny. Hence the woman is called ‘**ABAH**=*the living, the life-generating*. The race came forth, but all tainted with sin and burdened with a sense of guilt. The curse pronounced upon man was symbolized in the serpent and every creeping thing. The life of Adam, which from the moment of the fall had abandoned itself to deception and falsehood, propagated its sinfulness (4 : 1, 25 ; 5 : 3, &c.,) and was sorely embittered by the increased development of sin in *Cain*, especially as betrayed by the murder of Abel. The creative act of God, however, had only been *perverted* by man. He could not annihilate his being and nature. The Lord, therefore, established His work anew in the *primeval promise (protoevangelium)* given (Gen. 3 : 15,) and proposed it to man in the attainment of salvation. Man’s original destiny was secured by divine intervention even after his sin, in a way that secured blessing even in chastisement. His destiny was to till the land, to people the earth, but he should now accomplish it with pain and sorrow; and yet his toils should have an end (3 : 19.) Then began man’s conflict with evil (of which the serpent was the symbol, but with direct reference to the personal Deceiver,) which, however, implies the presence of a better principle in his soul, and that he should ultimately survive the sorrows of sin, and vanquish it. The *promise* awakened the expectation that the curse of his exclusion from paradise, and his fallen nature, should be abolished, and its fulfilment was connected with the woman’s *seed*. Wherefore it was said upon the birth of *Cain*: “I have gotten a man from the Lord” (Gen. 4 : 1.) Eve did not mean the God-man (the man, Jehovah, according to the usual orthodox interpretation: for that idea is the *result*, not the starting-point of the O. T. dispensation,) but a man, a second one in the world, who belongs unto Jehovah, and was born for Him. She regarded Cain, therefore, either in himself or in his posterity, as the man through whom the promised

help should come. The birth of *Abel* ('**ABEL**=a *withering vanity*, not because his life was brief, but because Adam and Eve began to feel their strength decaying, and therefore longed more ardently for the promised salvation) afforded further assurance of God's gracious purpose.

In the history of *Cain* and *Abel* the difference of occupation is significant. The earth is under a curse, and yet *Cain*, the hardier of the two, attempted to make it productive, and became an husbandman; having a less clear consciousness of sin, the curse did not deter him. The deeper convictions of quiet *Abel* led him to adopt more innocent employment. The offerings of both show a mutual seeking after God. But their offerings differ, not so much in the nature of that which they present (*Hoffman* and *Baumgarten*, Comm. on the Pentateuch,) or because the life of animals was holier than the fruit of the earth, but in the diverse spirit of the men. In *Cain* there was a haughty sense of self-sufficiency. *Abel* offered with an humble conviction of his need of God's blessing. A divine omen (perhaps an enveloping flame, or a flash of light?) indicated God's preference. *Cain* was enraged, thirsted for vengeance, slew his brother.—Darkness once more eclipsed the hope of the unhappy parents. *Abel* had died without progeny; *Cain* had fled, so that the Restorer could not be looked for from him. Sin and death exhibited themselves in the case of *Cain* as in that of *Adam*, only in a more glaring and hideous form; and yet he is spared, and made the founder of a race, which, however, in all its successive developments rushes down to ultimate destruction.—The Lord again comes to the help of man, and the hope of salvation revives with the birth of *Seth* (**SETH**=set, placed, planted,) whose posterity stand in contrast with the descendants of *Cain*, as the "sons of God" (Gen. 6: 2,) the true line through which the great promise should be fulfilled. *Adam* and *Eve*, however, spent their years and died in ungratified hope, whilst *Seth*, ever approximating to its realization through *some* of his descendants (*Enos*, *Enoch*, &c.,) nevertheless foresaw the conflict threatened by the perverse affection of *others* for the enticing daughters of *Cain*.

Distinct traces of this sacred history of the *fall* are found in the *Thug* doctrine of *Brahminism*, in the transmigration theo-

ry of the *Buddhists*, in the dualism of the *Parsees*, in the primeval disturbance of the felicity of the gods by serpents and dragons, taught in the mythologies of the *Scandinavians* and *Mexicans*, in the *Egyptian* traditions of the kingdom of Osiris and its downfall, in the *Chinese* traditions of the ancient wise kings, and in the *Greek* and *Roman* myths of the saturnian age of the world. Its ethical and psychological truth and depth have been almost universally acknowledged. *Josephus* relates it in a purely historical, though externally apprehended, form (*Antiq.* 1, 1. 4,) but adds some strange conceits about the serpent. It is similarly regarded by those church-fathers who do not (like *Philo*, *Clement of Alex.*, *Origen*, *Augustine*) consider the entire narrative an *allegory*, among whom are *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian* (and in part *Augustine*.) This also was the orthodox view of the subject during the middle ages, and was retained as such by *Luther*, *Zwingle*, *Melancthon*, *Calvin*, *Gerhart*, *Ursinus*, &c. There were indeed differences of opinion about the relation of the serpent to the devil, the nature of the pernicious effects of the forbidden fruit, and the sense in which death followed the transgression, whether spiritually only, or whether Adam really died 1000 years later on the same day of the week (*Friday*) on which he sinned! *Burnet*, *Jerusalem*, *Eichhorn* and others strip the historical record of its proper force, whilst *Zacharias*, *Kramer*, *Ludewald* strictly adhere to it. These were followed by *Gabler* (*J. G. Eichhorn's Urgeschichte*, herausg. v. *J. Ph. Gabler*, *Altorf*, 1790-93, 3 Bde.,) who pronounced "the whole history an absurdity," whilst he himself substituted *stupid vagaries*! Others subsequently treated it as a myth derived from the Grecian Pandora-legend, or from Persian and Kalmuc traditions. Another class of interpreters pronounced it a philosophical myth, so pliable that it could be turned to any account (*G. L. Bauer*, *Bibl. Theol. d. A. T.* § 105; *u. hebr. Mythol.* I. 85, &c.) The profoundest views concerning the origin of evil, as well as the silliest absurdities are put into the lips of the poets, and reporters of the myth. *Eichhorn* got down at last to a physical explanation of the matter (the eating of a poisonous plant.) The modern view of the speculative myth, advocated by *Kant*, *Schelling*, *Buttmann*, *Schiller*, &c., (explaining the

fall as an exhibition of the origin of evil in man's general nature as a necessary development, one that was essential to his attainment to completeness of personal existence,) has made it fashionable, in the genuine spirit of recent rationalistic theories upon the subject, to deny all historical value to the scriptural account of the fall. *De Wette* (*Sittenlehre*, I. 182) can see nothing in it but a transition from an innocent state of ease and inactivity to one of cultivation or degeneracy; *v. Bohlen* on the other hand (*Genesis*, p. 46, &c.) assumes that it is all a myth, and in his usual style turns everything upside down. Among biblical theologians *Baumgarten-Crusius* resorts, as he frequently does when he has no clear perceptions of the subject, to critical circumlocutions (p. 347;) *v. Colln* (I, 224, &c.) expatiates rather confusedly upon rationalistic notions much older than himself; *Buttmann* and *de Wette* retract their previous derivation of the myth from Persian and Greek mythology. *Gesenius* (*Ersch* and *Gruber Encycl. Art. Adam*) furnishes a useful review of the various interpretations, but fully adopts the opinion of *Buttmann*; his synopsis of oriental traditions concerning Adam may also be consulted with advantage. *Steudel* (bibl. Theol. d. A. T. 100, &c.) takes a more profound and earnest view of the subject, so likewise *Lutz* (bibl. Dogmatik, 112. &c.,) *Erdmann* (Bauer's Zeitschr. f. spekul. Theol., 1847, 2, 192. &c.) *Hegel* (Relig. Philos., 2, 72, &c.,) *Nitzsch* (System d. chr. L. § 106, &c.,) but they still find it difficult to admit the historic reality of the incidents reported. *Hoffmann*, *Delitzsch*, *Kurtz*, *Baumgarten*, and *Havernick* are the first among recent theologians who acknowledge the proper authority of the Mosaic narrative. And yet simplicity of form in the traditional myths of the origin of sin is so obviously natural, as to constitute a strong presumption in favor of the authenticity and literal reality of that which the Bible declares to have occurred in so simple a manner: for man, in the infancy of his being, derived his ideas immediately from facts. His conceptions of things necessarily pre-suppose that they were presented to his mind in a manner suited to his comprehension. How then can the conclusion be avoided, that the Mosaic record reports historical verities? DR. W. HOFFMAN.*

ART. VI.—LITURGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

CONSECRATION OF A CHURCH.

[The services shall commence with the reading of the following passages of Scripture, and the offering of the following prayer. The congregation shall be requested to rise.]

Make a joyful noise unto God, all ye lands. Serve the Lord with gladness : enter into his presence with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise. Be thankful unto him and bless his name.

O that men would praise the Lord for his goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of men. Let them exalt him also in the congregation of the people, and praise him in the assembly of the elders.

How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts ! A day in thy courts is better than a thousand.

Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord ? or who shall rise up in his holy place ?

Even he that hath clean hands and a pure heart, and that hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully. He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of his salvation.

This is the generation of them that seek him, that seek thy face, O Jacob. Lift up your heads, O ye gates ; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the king of glory shall come in.

Who is this king of glory ? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle.

Lift up your heads, O ye gates ; even lift them up, ye everlasting doors, and the king of glory shall come in.

Who is this king of glory ? The Lord of hosts, he is the king of glory.

O eternal God, mighty in power, and of majesty incomprehensible, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, much less the walls of temples made with hands, to thee alone be praise and adoration, from the hosts above and from us who dwell on the earth and are creatures of the dust. With hearts

full of gratitude and joy, this congregation is assembled to worship thee in this newly-erected sanctuary, which has been completed under thy gracious protection, and which we intend now to dedicate to thy glorious name. The first offerings that we shall bring to thee shall be humble thanksgiving, joyful praise, and holy reverence. Send down upon us all thy Holy Spirit, that we may lift up holy hands to thee, and worship thee with pure hearts. Come into our midst in thy majesty and thy goodness. O God, who art from everlasting to everlasting, hear us for the sake of thy dear Son, Jesus Christ our Saviour, who hath taught us to pray :

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name ; thy kingdom come ; thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day, our daily bread ; and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us : and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

[The congregation being seated, they shall be addressed as follows, after the singing of the 132nd Psalm, 2nd part, *Arise, O King of grace, arise, &c.*]

In all past ages, God has had a Church upon the earth, and has been publicly worshipped by his people. The Church has been established, and divine worship appointed by the Lord, who would have his children meet together for instruction, prayer, and praise. As early as the time of Enos, the son of Seth, and the third from Adam, men began publicly to call on the name of the Lord in a solemn assembly. When only three pious families were yet in existence, the appointment was made to meet together in one place, at stated times, to call upon God in prayer and thanksgiving, and to offer a sacrifice in common for the whole people.

Under the Mosaic dispensation, there was one place appointed for the gathering of the people, one altar erected, and the times and ceremonies of worship were prescribed with great minuteness ; and from the time of Solomon down to the time of Christ, the temple of Jerusalem was the only authorized house of public sacrifice and prayer.

Under the new and better dispensation, divine worship may be celebrated at any time, and at any place. Christianity is

designed for the whole earth. The Apostles were commanded by the Head of the Church to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. Whosoever believes in Jesus shall not perish, but shall have everlasting life. The religion of Christ is a more free and spiritual worship than the Jewish, as it is not confined to a particular nation, nor to a particular place, nor to particular times, nor consisting in any prescribed ceremonies, besides the simple, but very significant and important sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Jewish types and shadows, forms and ceremonies, have all been done away with in Christ Jesus, and now whosoever worships the Father in spirit and in truth, at any time, and at any place, shall be accepted of him. Where two or three are gathered together in my name, said Jesus, there am I in the midst of them.

The place, however, where God most delights to dwell, and where he dispenses his richest blessings to his people, is the sanctuary. Here his holy gospel is preached ; here his holy sacraments are administered ; here his holy worship is celebrated, and here his holy presence is enjoyed. The Lord is in his holy temple, let all the earth keep silence before him. Praise waits for thee, O God, out of Zion. The Lord hath chosen Zion, and there will he dwell, for he hath desired it. Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined. And in Zion, God hath placed salvation for Israel, his glory. O come, let us worship and bow down ; let us be thankful unto him and bless his name. Let us sing praise unto the Lord with our whole heart, in the assembly of the upright, and in the great congregation. In the midst of the Church, will we sing praise unto our God.

The house that is solemnly and appropriately set apart for divine worship, is the place where God records his name, and where his people feel most of his gracious presence, in Jesus Christ our Lord. It is indeed the house of God, and the very gate of heaven. *There it is* that believers hold the sweetest fellowship with heaven, and that the delightful communion of saints is most fully enjoyed.

God in his earthly temple lays,
Foundation for his heavenly praise ;

He likes the tents of Jacob well,
But still in Zion loves to dwell.

His mercy visits ev'ry house,
That pays its night and morning vows ;
But makes a more delightful stay,
Where churches meet to praise and pray.

The consecration of a house of worship is the setting of it apart from a common to a sacred use. It is thereby dedicated exclusively to the service of God. A solemn sacredness is imparted to it, by the use to which it is appointed. It becomes united with our religion, with a sense of God's presence, and with the doctrines, the duties, the hopes and consolations of Christianity; and it partakes in a measure of the same sanctity. The transaction of all secular business should be excluded from it, and none but holy thoughts and feelings should fill the minds and hearts of those who enter into its sacred courts.

For the purpose of dedicating this house to the worship of God we are now assembled. But let us first rehearse from the sacred Scriptures, in what manner, thousands of years ago, the first temple of the only true God upon earth was solemnly dedicated, as we read in 1st Kings, part of the 8th chapter.

And Solomon stood before the altar of the Lord in the presence of all the congregation of Israel, and spread forth his hands towards heaven :

And he said, Lord God of Israel, there is no God like thee, in heaven above, or on earth beneath, who keepest covenant and mercy with thy servants that walk before thee with all their heart :

Who has kept with thy servant David my father that thou promisedst him : thou spakest also with thy mouth, and hast fulfilled it with thine hand, as it is this day.

Therefore now, Lord God of Israel, keep with thy servant David, my father, that thou promisedst him, saying, There shall not fail thee a man in my sight to sit on the throne of Israel; so that thy children take heed to their way, that they walk before me, as thou hast walked before me.

And now, O God of Israel, let thy word, I pray thee, be verified, which thou spakest unto thy servant David, my father. But will God indeed dwell on the earth ? Behold the heav-

en and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee, how much less this house that I have builded !

Yet have thou respect unto the prayer of thy servant, and to his supplication, O Lord my God, to hearken unto the cry and to the prayer, which thy servant prayeth before thee to-day.

That thine eyes may be open toward this house night and day, even towards the place of which thou hast said, My name shall be there : that thou mayest hearken unto the prayer which thy servant shall make toward this place ; and hear thou in heaven, thy dwelling place, and when thou hearest, forgive.

And it was so, that when Solomon had made an end of praying all this prayer and supplication unto the Lord, he arose from before the altar of the Lord, from kneeling on his knees with his hands spread up to heaven.

And he stood and blessed all the congregation of Israel with a loud voice, saying,

Blessed be the Lord, that hath given rest unto his people Israel, according to all that he promised ; that there hath not failed one word of all his good promise, which he promised by the hand of Moses his servant.

The Lord our God be with us, as he was with our fathers : let him not leave us, nor forsake us :

That he may incline our hearts unto him, to walk in all his ways, and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgments, which he commanded our fathers.

This God is our God, forever and ever, and to none other do we raise our temples. But "blessed are the eyes which see the things which we see." We worship our God according to his last and blissful revelation in his Son Jesus Christ. We build our temples and the salvation of our souls upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner stone.

Accompany me now with your hearts and voices, while I pronounce the Articles of our Catholic, undoubted Christian faith.

[Here the minister will request the congregation to rise, and to remain standing until the consecratory services are ended. He will also request them to repeat with him the Apostles' Creed.]

I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; And in Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, our

Lord ; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary : suffered under Pontius Pilate : was crucified, dead, and buried ; he descended into hell ; the third day he rose from the dead ; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty : from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost : I believe in the Holy Catholic Church : the communion of Saints : the forgiveness of sins : the resurrection of the body ; and the life everlasting. Amen.

[Act of Consecration.]

The congregation who are now assembled in this place, have erected this house for the worship of God, and desire that it be solemnly set apart to that object. They have given to it the name of—— ; and by this name we now set apart this house, and dedicate it to the worship of the triune God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; and henceforth let this house be a house of God, where his name shall be honored, and his gospel shall be proclaimed and his blessings shall descend from heaven upon his children. Amen.

[Here the congregation shall be requested to kneel, and then the following prayer shall be offered :]

O Lord, our God, there is no God beside thee. Thou alone art worthy to receive adoration and praise ; for thou hast made all things, and through thee they continue to exist. Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty ! Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints ! Who would not fear thee, O Lord, and magnify thy name ? For thou art holy, and all nations shall come to worship before thee, when they learn the joy of thy salvation. Glory be to thy name, that we are permitted to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent ; and through this knowledge to receive pardon, sanctification and eternal life.

We give thee thanks, O God, for the foundation of thy Church on earth, for thy oracles, and for the ministry of thy word. We thank thee, that by thy providence, this house has been erected for the worship of thy name, that the Gospel of thy Son may be proclaimed in it, and sinners may be called to repentance, and thy people may be edified in it unto life eternal. We pray thee now to accept the works of our hands.

Let this house be indeed a house of God. Let thy presence be in it, and dwell thou in the midst of the assembly that shall worship here. Give to it ministers of thy Gospel who shall be men after thine own heart, and own and bless their labors, with copious effusions of thy Spirit, that they may be effectual in the conversion of sinners from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, and in waking up thy people more and more, and edifying them in their holy faith. When thy holy word is read and preached in this place, and the holy sacraments are administered, send down upon the congregation thy Holy Spirit, so that the minds and hearts of all may be savingly impressed. When thy people bring to thee their thanksgiving for the gifts of thy providence, accept their offering, and bless them in it, that their joy may be full ; and when, in seasons of calamity and distress, they humble themselves before thee, and implore thy mercy, hear thou in heaven and pity them ; forgive their sins that may have provoked thy displeasure, and deliver them ; or comfort and support them under their trial, and sanctify their affliction unto them, that it may bring forth, in due time, the peaceable fruits of righteousness. Cause thy name, O Lord, to be hallowed, and thy kingdom to come, and thy will to be done, by means of this house, both among the congregation who shall worship in it, and in the community among which they dwell ; that our labor be not in vain ; that there may be joy in heaven over sinners who repent, and that we may have confidence, and not be ashamed in the presence of Jesus at his coming.

Hear us, we beseech thee, O God of all grace, Father of all light, and Fountain of good. Let our prayer come up before thee, and be acceptable, through the merit of Jesus Christ, and do unto us according to thy great mercy and love ; and unto thee, the King immortal, invisible; who alone art mighty, and wise, and good ; who dwellest in light which no man can approach ; unto thee be all glory, through Jesus Christ, in heaven and on earth, forever and ever. Amen.

[Here the collection may be taken up ; and after the singing of a suitable Psalm or Hymn, the sermon and other parts of the worship shall follow.]

ART. VII.—**SHORT NOTICES.**

LINGARD'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND, abridged: with a continuation from 1688 to 1854. By *James Burke, Esq., A. B.*, to which is prefixed a Memoir of Dr. Lingard, and Marginal Notes. By M. J. Kerney, A. M., Baltimore John Murphy & Co. 1855.

Cardinal Wiseman says of Lingard's celebrated History of England, which reaches, in thirteen volumes, down to the Revolution of 1688, and has recently been re-published by a house in Boston from the last London edition: "It is a providence, that, in history, we have had given to the nation a writer like Lingard, whose gigantic merit will be better appreciated in each successive generation, as it sees his work standing calm and erect amidst the shoals of petty pretenders to usurp his station. When Hume shall have fairly taken his place among the classical writers of our tongue, and Macaulay shall have been transferred to the shelves of romances and poets, and each shall thus have received his true meed of praise, then Lingard will be still more conspicuous as the only impartial historian of our country. This is a mercy indeed, a rightful honor to him, who, at such a period, worked his way, not into a high rank, but to the very loftiest point of literary position."

We do not agree altogether with this judgment. We doubt whether Macaulay will ever be laid on the shelves, and his History of England numbered with mere novels. Lingard is as partial to the Catholic Church, as most of the Protestant historians are to their creed and fellow religionists. Although comparatively liberal and honestly striving to measure out praise and censure irrespective of sect and party, he shows his Catholic sympathies almost in every chapter and becomes involuntarily the apologist of the unfortunate Mary Stuart, and the accuser of her proud rival, Elizabeth. We can hardly expect anything else. Every historian, who is not an indifferentist, is unconsciously under the influence of his religion in selecting, arranging and viewing his facts, and he ought to allow it its full share to the best of his judgment. An absolute objectivity is as impossible, as undesirable. For history is full of religious life, and no one is able to represent it properly, whose mind and heart is shut up against it. In England, especially, Church and State religion and politics were,

until quite recently, so intimately interwoven, that the one cannot be exhibited without the other, and without constant reference to the great controversy between Romanism and Protestantism. Now Lingard is as little infallible and free from all party bias in this respect as most historians. He himself properly remarks, in the preface to the first volume, "The writer as he is always exposed to the danger, will occasionally suffer himself to be misled by the secret prejudices, or the unfair statements of the authors, whom it is his duty to consult."

With this qualification we are quite willing to admit that Lingard is as impartial as any other historian of England, and as to extent and thoroughness of investigation, accuracy of statements, lucid arrangement of facts, and classical purity of style, he is inferior to none. He will always occupy one of the first ranks and be consulted as an authority on the history of England from the first invasion by the Romans to the commencement of the reign of William the Third. We never study a chapter of English history without consulting him, and we always find solid and reliable information in his pages.

To those who cannot procure the original work, and yet wish to know the Roman Catholic account of the history of the greatest Protestant nation, we can recommend the abridgment of Mr. Burke. It is faithfully done, and gives as much as possible the very words of Lingard. The continuation from the Revolution of 1688 to the reign of Queen Victoria, (from page 592 to 662) might be far more full and interesting. As may be expected from the author and publisher, it betrays decided Catholic and Irish sympathies. The volume is gotten up in elegant style, adorned with a portrait of Lingard, and enriched with a short memoir of his life, a sketch of the English constitution and a list of eminent Englishmen.

HEAVEN; or, an Earnest and Scriptural Inquiry into the Abode of the Sainted Dead. By Rev. H. Harbaugh, A. M., 12th edition. Phil'a. Lindsay & Blakiston, 1856.

THE HEAVENLY RECOGNITION, or, an Earnest and Scriptural discussion of the question, "Will we know our friends in Heaven?" By Rev. H. Harbaugh, A. M., 9th edition. Phil'a. Lindsay & Blakiston, 1856.

THE HEAVENLY HOME; or, the Employments and Enjoyments of the Saints in Heaven. By Rev. H. Harbaugh, A. M., 6th edition. Phil'a. Lindsay & Blakiston, 1856.

"Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" is the uniform question of metropolitan pride, touching all that is provincial—Athens sneering at Boeotia. Against this formidable prejudice every literary work from a rural district is obliged to contend. But, in addition, it often meets with undeserved neglect at home. Our Saviour's word was: "a prophet is not without honor, save in

his own country." The feeling which produces such a state of things, belongs to human nature, and is, therefore, universal. We are all disposed to overlook or undervalue the achievements of our neighbor, who meets us daily in the street. He seems altogether one of us, and we are slow from the workings of self-love or other causes to admit their worth, much less to praise the offspring of his hand or of his brain. Only when the voices abroad become so loud in their favor that we cannot turn a deaf ear any longer, do we begin to yield a reluctant assent and suffer our jealousies to lapse into silence.

These remarks were suggested by the great and growing popularity of the above named series of volumes, from the pen of the Rev. H. Harbaugh—a popularity proved by the fact, that the first has already reached the 12th edition; the second, the 9th, and the third, the 5th—proved by the fact, that a number of imitators have arisen in Boston and elsewhere, who have freely borrowed from their pages, and in some instances without the slightest acknowledgment, and also by the fact that they have been re-published in England, and have obtained an extensive circulation there.

Now, we are well aware that popularity is no sure test of excellence. Many books of the very highest order find but few readers, whilst others, which have little to recommend them, save the food furnished to the worst passions of our nature, are eagerly devoured by thousands. But with works on practical religion, which treat of the most solemn realities, and are read for profit, not for pleasure, the case is quite different. Popularity here is an evidence that they reach and satisfy some of the deepest wants and longings of the human soul. And honor is certainly due to the pastor, who can thus attract the attention and influence the hearts of such a vast congregation of readers, drawing their thoughts and desires away from the vanities of earth, to the glories of that higher and better world, after which we all aspire.

It is not necessary to offer an analysis of these volumes. What has been said is sufficient to show the esteem in which they are held by the religious public, and their titles clearly indicate their contents. We would simply add, that they are well worthy of a place in the library of every Christian man and woman, who by the loss of near and dear friends, the trials of life, or the promptings of faith "are looking for a better country, even an heavenly."

UNION WITH THE CHURCH: *the Solemn Duty and the Blessed Privilege of all who would be saved.* By the Rev. Henry Harbaugh, author of "Heaven, or the Sainted Dead;" "The Heavenly Recognition;" "The Birds of the Bible," &c. Second edition, revised. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. A little duodecimo of 127 pages that, without making any pretensions to abstruse theological disquisition, is nevertheless a polished shaft tipped with sharp steel and driven at the heart of the enemy. Presuming correctly that a number of well-meaning persons remain out of the Church of Jesus Christ, the form of the kingdom of heaven on earth, because the progress of sectism and rationalism has produced a false public sentiment in relation to the nature of the Church, the author, in the First Part, removes the difficulties which

present themselves to sincere inquirers, and in the Second, presents a series of convincing arguments in favor of immediate union with the mystical body of Christ. The spirit of the work is earnest; the style, plain and direct—vague circumlocution, that says nothing for fear of saying something too forcibly, being left for declaimers; and the argument, upon a level with the comprehension of all classes of society.

Christ saves sinners *by* the Church and *in* the Church; not *without* the Church nor *out* of the Church. This is the main idea of the volume, looking out upon the reader from beginning to end, and with such a piercing eye as to make the thoughtful quail, who expect to escape the rising flood whilst standing on the top of the doomed mountains. A circulation of the little book will render Pastors a good service.

PATRIARCHY; or, *The Family: its Constitution and Probation;* By John Harris, D. D., President of New College, London, and Author of "Pre-Adamite Earth," "Man Primeval," "Great Teacher," "Great Commission," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln; New York: Sheldon, Lamport & Blakeman. 1855. pp. 472, Phil'a.: Smith & English.

The space allotted to this notice will not admit of a lengthened review of the book, which has called it forth. The most we can do is briefly to advert to its design and general contents.

The Family is justly regarded as a divine institution, indispensable to the unfolding of the individual man, to his answering the end of his being, and to the promotion of his happiness. The general design of the work before us is, to exhibit the family in its constitution and probation. It is divided into four parts. The first part is devoted to the laws or method of the domestic constitution. The second indicates the stages and changes, through which the patriarchal community may have passed in the course of its probationary history. In the third, the reasons for the method and history of the domestic constitution are set forth. And in the fourth, the ultimate end of the family probation and economy as a means of divine manifestation, is unfolded. The work is truly logical and written in a very forcible style. It will admit of a careful perusal and study, and will abundantly repay the reader for the labor and time he may appropriate to such a purpose.

THE FAMILY ASSISTANT; or *Book of Prayers for the use of Families; to which are added Prayers for special occasions. Original and selected.* By Samuel R. Fisher. Chambersburg, Pa.: M. Kieffer & Co. pp. 308.

The great desideratum in forms of prayer for general use, is simplicity and naturalness of style, as well as a sufficient variety to meet the different occasions which may occur in the course of Christian experience. To meet this want, particularly in the sphere of his own denomination, has been a main object of the author in the preparation of the work before us. How far he has succeeded in this, he has very properly left to the judgment of others; and this, as far as it has yet transpired, we are gratified to be able to say, is decidedly in his favor.